DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 503 IR 051 862

AUTHOR	Wurzbacher, Mark F.; Yeannakis, Christine H.
TITLE	California Literacy Campaign: Program Effectiveness Review II.
INSTITUTION	Wurzbacher and Associates, Adelphi, MD.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Library, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	15 Sep 86
NOTE	196p.; For an earlier evaluation of CLC, see ED 263 917; for a specific CLC program, see IR 051 861.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Literacy; Educational Assessment; *Library Services; *Literacy Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Libraries; Questionnaires; State Aid; State Libraries; *State Programs; Surveys; *Tutorial Programs; Tutors
IDENTIFIERS	*California Literacy Campaign

ABSTRACT

This review of the California Literacy Campaign (CLC), a statewide, community-oriented, library-based program funded under the California Library Services Act, is designed to determine the extent to which CLC has been effective in carrying out its mission, the manner in which increased effectiveness may be achieved, and ways in which program effectiveness can be more accurately gauged in the future. Following background information on CLC, results of the study are presented in three chapters that describe the learners and tutors who participated in the evaluation, present descriptive information on the tutoring experience from both learner and tutor perspectives, and provide descriptive and analytical information on learner skills improvement and life enhancement outcomes. A final chapter summarizes the results of the study and provides recommendations for program modifications and future evaluations. Statistical information is presented in 17 tables, and the following information is appended: (1) a listing of communities served by the CLC; (2) a CLC program location map; (3) a CLC contact list; (4) a CLC status report; (5) the student interview guide; and (6) the tutor questionnaire. An executive summary is also provided. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED280503

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN: PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

by

Mark F. Wurzbacher
and
Christine H. Yeannakis

Submitted to

Mr. Gary E. Strong
State Librarian
and
Chief Executive Officer
California State Library
P.O. Box 942837
Sacramento, California 94237-0001

on

September 15, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Collin Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WURZBACHER AND ASSOCIATES
Human Service Consultants
10431 Edgefield Drive
Adelphi, MD 20783
(301) 439-5367

IR051862

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foreword

When the California Literacy Campaign was begun by the State Library in September, 1983 with $2.5 million in federal Library Services and Construction Act funds, the nation's literacy providers were guardedly optimistic, at best. The Campaign was an ambitious undertaking. Many observers thought it was too ambitious, too idealistic, too dependent upon federal funds. What could the State Library provide or initiate that would "significantly reduce" California's adult illiterate population?

But after just a few month's existence, the California Literacy Campaign was showing signs of unusual success and potential--so much so that some $2.6 million in state general funds were appropriated to continue and expand the Campaign.

In the summer of 1984, an extensive program effectiveness review of the then 8-month-old Campaign was undertaken. Records were studied, 93 students were interviewed by phone, while 112 tutors and 24 of the 27 literacy coordinators were interviewed via mailed questionnaires.

The results spoke for themselves: approximately 3,500 students were receiving help, most on a one-to-one basis with a volunteer; about a thousand had been referred to more suitable programs such as Adult Basic Education classes. Two-thirds of students interviewed rated their tutors as excellent, while 94% of the students said that CLC reading programs were definitely helping them--and they could give concrete examples of how and why.

The evidence suggested that CLC's early successes were possible because of: 1) the provision for and insistence upon flexibility and responsiveness to each local community situation; 2) the early establishment of local coalitions which broadly represented their communities, including their potential student populations; 3) the excellent supportive and technical assistance services provided by the State Library; 4) start-up funds large enough to adequately staff each program from the beginning and 5) the credibility and resources of the State and local libraries.

The evaluation found shortcomings, too, and made a number of recommendations, including: more student involvement at all levels of each program; exploration of alternative and multiple means of providing instruction; better measurement of student progress; better training of tutors and students in goal-setting; development of a practical, pertinent, unified record-keeping system; provision for a longer "start-up" period for new programs and increased technical assistance regarding management of local literacy programs.

Subsequent state budget augmentations enabled 21 additional programs to get underway in 1985. By year's end, 5,657 adult learners were being taught by 4,079 tutors at 500 different community sites.

With 1986 came the need for another close-up examination of the Campaign, hence this report. While possibly twice as much research about our nation's functional literacy needs exists now as existed in 1984, there still is a scarcity of information about and from adult learners. This evaluation is a big step in that much-needed direction. (Readers of this report would do well to compare its findings with those of the recently-released National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report titled Literacy: Profiles of America's Young Adults. Sections regarding definitions of literacy and types of materials "literate" persons need to be able to use are particularly thought-provoking.)

This report's research team gave major attention to tutor and learner perceptions regarding both skills improvement and life skills enhancement. The research design was unique in that it closely examined the experiences of 86 matched learner/tutor pairs. More such work needs to be done.

Throughout this report, findings of the two CLC program effectiveness reviews are compared. Again the results speak for themselves. There has been continued significant growth and development, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Local programs are doing a better job of reaching the so-called "harder to reach." For example, at least 23% of CLC adult learners are "educationally disenfranchised, socioeconomically disadvantaged persons". Further, an impressive mix of ethnic backgrounds is represented. Adult learners identified themselves as 11.5% Asian, 14.2% Black, 35% Hispanic, 1.1% Native American, .9% Pacific Islanders, 35% White and 2.4% "Other". (English is the home language of nearly 80% of these students.) Significant progress has been made in overcoming all the shortcomings identified in 1984.

The sections of this report discussing methods and materials will be especially helpful to literacy providers nationwide. As CLC programs have involved adult learners more fully at all local levels, the students have become more involved in such lesson-planning activities as goal-setting and materials selection. The programs have responded by providing a wider variety of materials and more relevant in-service training opportunities. Such freedom to search for and try alternative materials, methods and means of service delivery has been encouraged continuously by the State Library. Client satisfaction has climbed as instruction has become more eclectic and learner-centered.

In his most recent book, Illiterate America, prize-winning author Jonathan Kozol called the California Literacy Campaign "one of the most impressive statewide [literacy] programs" in the nation. "With strong community emphasis, [the Campaign] is a model of effective local effort," Kozol noted. He added that the California Literacy Campaign has demonstrated "what might be done someday with major national commitment."

The California State Library's innovative literacy programming backed by the state government's financial resources is, indeed, impressive. If both significant funding and the quest for excellence in learner-centered literacy programming continue as seriously as they have been started, California will undoubtedly develop many significant new community literacy program models.

I have had the special privilege of watching the California Literacy Campaign close-up, first as one of the many national literacy program directors with which State Library staff shared their earliest visions, then as lead evaluator of the first CLC program effectiveness review. I await future California Literacy Campaign developments with eagerness--and with high expectations. I'm sure you will, too, after reading this report.

Martha A. Lane
Adult Literacy Consultant
and Coordinator of
Lutheran Church Women's
Volunteer Reading Aides Program.

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
Program Effectiveness Review II (PER)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Literacy Campaign (CLC) is a community-oriented, library-based literacy program initiated by State Librarian Gary E. Strong in January 1984 with one-time, Federal funding provided under the Library Services and Construction Act. Under administrative authority of the California Library Services Board (CLSB) and with continuation and expansion funding provided under the California Library Services Act (CLSA), the CLC has grown to include 47 local jurisdictions, in over 150 communities. Technical assistance and support service are provided to these programs by the California State Library (CSL). CLSA funding for the Campaign in State fiscal year 1985/86 (July 1985 through June 1986) was $3.5 million. According to CLC program reports, as of December 31, 1985, 4,079 tutors were providing literacy instruction to 5,657 adult learners.

The PER II evaluation plan was developed in late February 1986 by Wurzbacher and Associates (WAA), with input and concurrence from the State Library. The purpose of the plan was to determine the extent to which the CLC has been effective in carrying out its mission, with implications for the manner in which increased program effectiveness can be achieved and ways in which program effectiveness can be more accurately assessed in the future.

The study was completed in September 1986.

The primary focus was on the expected service outcomes of improvement in the functional literacy skills of CLC adult learners and enhancements in the lives of these learners associated with such skills improvement. The secondary focus was on the program components developed to achieve these outcomes, which had been the primary focus of PER I. Three principal sources of data were utilized:

- results from administration of a structured interview guide to a random sample of adult learners;
- results from administration of a questionnaire to tutors of the randomly selected adult learners; and
- organizational development information provided by the State Library, much of it derivative from quarterly reports provided by local library literacy programs.

Following data collection, compilation, and categorization, descriptive statistical procedures were employed for preliminary analysis of program component and service outcome variables and discovery of relationships among them. Alternative hypotheses were formulated for explanation of these relationships and additional statistical procedures were utilized to reach final interpretations of the results and to formulate recommendations for future conduct of the California Literacy Campaign.

A. THE ADULT LEARNERS AND THEIR TUTORS

A total of 104 CLC adult learners from 31 programs were interviewed and 99 tutors from 32 programs completed questionnaires, inclusive of 86 matched pairs of adult learners and their tutors. Of the adult learners, 81 were still receiving tutoring at the time they were interviewed, with 20 having "dropped out" of their programs and two having "finished the course." Of the tutors, 82 were teaching at the time they completed the questionnaire, 10 were awaiting new students, 4 were no longer tutoring, and 3 did not give information on their current program status. Of the 99 tutors, 90 were volunteers and 9 were paid staff.

The PER II adult learner sample was intended to be representative of the CLC adult learner population so as to allow for generalization of the PER II service outcome results to the CLC program as-a-whole. The PER II sample was similar to the CLC adult learner population receiving instruction as of December 31, 1985, with respect to sex, and comparable with respect to age (albeit slightly older) and ethnicity (albeit somewhat more white and black and somewhat less Hispanic and Asian). In comparison to the entire CLC second quarter adult learner population, the PER II sample was similar with respect to percentage of "active" learners (that is, those still receiving instruction) and percentage of "graduates" (that is, those who had "met goal" and left the program for "positive reasons"). However, the PER II sample contained an over-representation of program "drop-outs" (that is, those who had left the program either because they had not benefitted from the program or for some unknown reason) and a substantial under-representation of learners who had become "physically inaccessible" (meaning they had left the program for reasons not directly related to program participation, such as having moved, become incarcerated, or died). Implementation of the sampling and contact procedures apparently screened out persons from the latter group, a large number during program listing of the sample universe and the rest during program attempts to secure contact information and participation agreements from the 200 learners selected to the original and replacement samples. Generalization of the PER II service outcome results to the CLC population as a whole must therefore be tempered by the exclusion of such learners from the study.

B. THE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

From the perspective of the PER II adult learners and their tutors, CLC program operations appear to be carried out in accordance with the general operational guidelines established by the California State Library.

(1) Assessment/Matching

Prior to tutoring, the majority of learners are interviewed and have their literacy skills checked to some degree. Most learners are matched with tutors within weeks of initial contact with the program.

At the personal level, approximately 60% of adult learners had their skills checked upon entering the program, although the majority either do not know or cannot recall the results. Half the adult learners report being involved in setting goals at the onset of tutoring, and three-quarters of the tutors report using this method on a regular basis with learners. However, at least half the learners have not had their skills checked since they began tutoring and, of those who have, about a fourth do not know or cannot recall the results.

(2) Tutor Training

Tutors are quite satisfied with their training. Most are matched with learners shortly after pre-service training has been completed. Based on tutor reports of what they liked best about their training and the methods and materials they use most frequently in their tutoring, it is apparent that the majority of the programs employ training and tutoring methods and materials derivative from those developed and promulgated by Laubach Literacy Action (LLA) and Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA). This includes emphasis on tutor utilization of a variety of teaching techniques and materials so as to better meet the learning needs of individual adult learners.

Most tutors and learners work together one-to-one, but about 10% of each also work in small group and classroom settings. Although 90% of tutors are

volunteers, the small percentage of paid tutors apparently has been a contributing factor to the development of program capacity to offer teaching in small group and classroom settings.

(3) **The Tutoring Experience**

Although most learners have a say as to where and when they meet, at least a fifth do not. Most tutors and learners are satisfied with where they meet for tutoring, which for the majority is in a public library. Fifteen percent say they want to meet elsewhere, with most of these wanting more quiet and privacy than that afforded by library meeting sites. The majority of learners and tutors are satisfied with the frequency of their meetings, which for the majority is two times a week. Forty percent of learners, as well as 24% of their tutors, want to have tutoring sessions more frequently.

A majority of adult learners and most tutors are quite satisfied with the teaching and learning materials used.

Most tutors and learners report learners to be doing homework, although learners report about twice as much time spent doing homework as do tutors, perhaps due to different interpretations of what constitutes "homework". Most learners get moral support for their learning activities from family and friends, some of whom also help learners with their learning activities. Most learners rate their tutors highly, and most tutors have derived a great deal of personal satisfaction from their teaching activities.

Thus, although learner satisfaction and participation is high, there is room for improvement with respect to the nature and degree of learner involvement in determining and assessing the program experience, both from a personal and an organizational point of view.

(4) **Beyond the Tutoring Experience**

On an organizational level, 90% of the adult learners report telling family members about the literacy program, and 60% say they "spread the word" to others. About a fifth of adult learners successfully recruit new learners into the literacy program. About 2% of adult learners are members of literacy program boards or community literacy coalitions and, about 5% of adult learners are actively involved in formal public communications activities engaged in by their literacy programs.

C. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS (Service Outcomes)

Tutor/Learner Perceptions of Program Effectiveness

As a group and in relation to a number of different measures, adult learners and their tutors left little doubt that most adult learners who participate in CLC local library literacy programs demonstrate functional skills improvement. In addition, the majority of adult learners who participate in CLC programs experience some change in their lives as a result of the literacy program experience, most frequently in relation to how they make use of their free time. Thus, there is compelling evidence that taking part in CLC program tutoring activities results not only in the increased ability of California adults to read, but in their reading more and reading more often, particularly with family members and most frequently with children. This may be linked to the fact that the one life enhancement outcome which correlated significantly with skills

improvement involved positive changes in learner relationships with members of the learner's family. As noted in the preceding section, these were the people most likely to be knowledgeable and supportive of the learner's participation in the literacy program.

The relationship between functional literacy skills improvement and other types of life changes is much less clear. Many adult learners come into the literacy program with previous, but largely unsatisfying experiences in adult education programs, and a number have formal educational goals which they desire to pursue. Obviously, then, many of them perceive formal education as an avenue to life enhancement and view participation in the literacy program as a step up that street. Perhaps this is a partial explanation for the finding that learner changes in educational goals correlated with functional literacy skills improvement only from the perspective of tutors; in short, some learners had already set these goals prior to tutoring, but some tutors were not aware of these goals or became aware of them only after the learner had shown skills improvement. However, even when learners and tutors agreed that learners had educational goals, tutors more often reported these goals to relate to completion of secondary educational requirements, whereas learners more often cited goals in relation to going to college. Similar differences between learner and tutor perceptions of learner goals were found in other areas, with learners more often reporting major, long-range goals and tutors more often reporting task-specific, short-range goals. Likewise, there were variations between learner and tutor assessments of learner skills, the nature and extent of learner progress while in the program, and the impact of the program upon the learner's life.

In rating learner functional literacy skills in relation to seven everyday reading tasks prior to tutoring, learners rated their skills higher than tutors did. Following tutoring, tutors rated learner skills in these tasks higher than learners did, thereby reporting more learner progress in this regard than did learners. In response to more open-ended questions relating to learner skills improvement, most tutors and learners reported specific reading gains, but tutors much more frequently cited writing gains as well. When citing the impact that participation in the program had had upon the learner, learners cited functional literacy skills improvement three times more often than tutors, while tutors cited improved self-confidence and self-esteem twice as often as learners. Although the majority of learners reported life changes as a result of participation in the literacy program, many tutors were not aware that such changes had occurred.

Discussion of Adult Learner/Tutor Perceptions

One could possibly argue that these results reflect unrealistic learner perceptions of what they can do, where they are going, and how they will get there. It is nonetheless apparent that learners and their tutors come to the tutoring experience with different expectations and perspectives as to the nature, content, direction, and outcomes of that experience. The tutor's perspective of the learner is limited, in most cases by the social and physical boundaries of the tutoring relationship. Typically, an adult learner and a tutor from decidedly different walks of life meet regularly once or twice a week for limited periods of time, often in public places, to work toward improving the learner's reading and writing skills. However ambiguous or disparate learner and tutor perceptions of the learner's hopes, dreams, and goals for the tutoring experience, the unwritten contract between the tutor and learner is for the teaching and learning of literacy skills.

while the boundaries of the tutoring relationship and the tenets of the unwritten tutoring contract may in most cases be appropriate, they may also subtly hinder communication between the learner and tutor with respect to the learner's literacy needs and related aspirations for the future. The learner and the tutor, in their commendable effort to stick to the task of "learning to read and write," may neglect important planning discussion and activities. Without such discussion and activity, the tutor can often only guess at the learner's expectations, and the learner can often only guess at how the work provided by the tutor relates to realization of the learner's expectations. It is possible that learner "fade-out" and "drop-out" may, in some cases, relate to this hypothesized lack of communication between the learner and tutor in relation to the process and intended outcomes of the tutoring situation.

Learner involvement in decision-making about where and when to meet appears to be related to demonstration of learner progress. But involvement in the learner process needs also to incorporate the tutor in assisting the learner in setting and agreeing to realistic, achievable and meaningful learning goals which relate to the learner's reasons for taking literacy instruction in the first place. More of this activity appeared to be taking place in CLC programs at the time of PER II than at the time of PER I, but obviously tutors need additional training in how to assist learners in learning how to establish, prioritize, and integrate long-term goals, short-term objectives, and strategies for achieving them.

D. SUMMARY

Adult learners who participate in California Literacy Campaign programs are California residents who desire and need literacy education. Most speak English in their daily lives, although slightly over five percent do not. Most are not being served by other educational programs at the time of entry into the literacy program, although about 40% have had largely unsatisfactory past experiences in adult basic education classes and about 5% are enrolled in college courses or trade schools.

Twenty-three percent of CLC adult learners appear to meet the profile of educationally disenfranchised, socio-economically disadvantaged persons for whom functional illiteracy probably constitutes a major barrier to upward mobility. These are persons with less than a ninth grade education for whom a combination of employment, income, and family status characteristics indicate they live below, at or about the poverty level. However, 37% of CLC adult learners have a high school degree and 34% have family incomes of more than $20,000 per year.

The majority of CLC adult learners appear to be working class individuals with some high school education and some functional literacy skills who perceive the local library literacy program as a viable medium for improving these skills so as to improve their lot in life. More intensive efforts are needed if CLC is to recruit and serve the truly "hard-to-reach, hard-to-teach" segment of California society.

The evaluation results do not provide a definitive answer to the question of whether participation in CLC programs enables adult learners to read and write English sufficiently to handle the functional literacy demands they face in their daily lives. In fact, there is suggestive evidence that some CLC adult learners possess some such competence upon entry into local library literacy programs.

However, there is little doubt that most CLC adult learners do demonstrate functional literacy skills improvement as a result of program participation.

Moreover, the majority of CLC learners link this improvement to some positive change in their lives. Most frequently, these changes occur in relation to use of their leisure time and, most significantly, in their relations with members of their families, but also, albeit to a lesser degree, in relation to changes in educational plans and employment status. As most of the learner participants were still in tutoring, it is of course not possible to reach conclusions about the long-term impact of their participation in the literacy program. Such determination will require a longitudinal evaluation design, which has yet to be employed by anyone in the study of adult literacy program effectiveness.

Most CLC tutors and learners give high ratings to the program training and teaching methods and materials used to pursue the service outcomes of learner skills improvement and life enhancement. There is substantial evidence that a variety of methods and materials are employed in pursuit of these outcomes, including increased use since PER I of goal planning methods based on learner strengths and needs so as to individualize instruction. However, the latter methods are presently being used with only about one-half of CLC adult learners and in many cases tutors appear to be insufficiently skilled for effective use of these methods.

Since PER I, more learners are meeting twice a week with their tutors, but many learners and a number of tutors still feel the need for additional instruction sessions. The evaluators can only speculate as to the reasons for this unmet need, which may include program reliance on volunteer tutors, temporal constraints imposed by learner and tutor participants, inadequate supplemental instructional resources, and the labor-intensive nature of the one-to-one instructional approach employed by the program.

Information provided by California State Library staff indicates that CLC programs are enjoying widespread community leadership, participation, and support, in part because of the development and use of more sophisticated public communications strategies, the most effective of which appear to involve the formation and collaboration of intra- and inter- juristictional literacy coalitions. Based on the final reports of the local library literacy programs, CLC exceeded its FY86 goals for in-kind resources and volunteer instructional hours. However, programs have inadequately addressed the need to develop local funding sources, such that at this time it appears unlikely that many will reach the CLC goal of programmatic financial independence from the State by the sixth year of program operations.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLC PROGRAM OPERATIONS.

The California Literacy Campaign should:

1. broaden the service population so as to more adequately address the needs of the "intermediate" learners presently being served by the program, while at the same time intensifying efforts to recruit and serve and "hard-to-reach, hard-to-teach" members of the functionally illiterate population in California.

2. increase tutor training focus on the development of interpersonal communication skills, particularly as they relate to goal-setting with the adult learner, and providing more supervisory assistance to tutors in the field so as to assist them in utilizing these skills.

3. develop additional instructional methods and resources to supplement and complement the one-to-one tutoring approach, inclusive of tutor training in the use of these methods and resources.

4. develop and field-test standard procedures for assessing learner progress, using as an initial format certain parts of the PER II Adult Learner Interview Guide.

5. develop and utilize strategies for increasing the participation of adult learners in the leadership of literacy programs and in the non-tutoring activities engaged in by the programs, particularly in the area of public communications.

6. continue to conduct program effectiveness reviews biennially, with changes in primary focus as appropriate to developments within the Campaign.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is a report of results from Program Effectiveness Review II (PER II) of the California Literacy Campaign (CLC), conducted by Wurzbacher and Associates (WAA) during the late Spring and early Summer of 1986 under contract to the California State Library (CSL). PER II is the second third-party evaluation conducted of the Campaign, the only state-wide literacy program funded and operated by a state library system in the United States. The initial evaluation, Program Effectiveness Review I (PER I), was conducted in the Fall of 1984 by Martha A. Lane of Lutheran Church Women with assistance from Wurzbacher and Associates.

The PER II principals, Mark F. Wurzbacher and Christine H. Yeannakis, would like to acknowledge the contributions of other WAA Associates to implementation of the PER II evaluation plan, including: Naomi and Gilberto Arriazi (Spanish interviews and English translations); Mary Dumont (data entry); Jean McGuire (draft review and revision); and Neela Seldin, Elizabeth Wurzbacher, and Lise Wurzbacher (data compilation and categorization). Our sincere gratitude to these Associates, as well as for the timely and professional services provided by Diane Coy, Word Tech Computer Services, Arlington, VA, and Quality Controlled Services, Concord, CA. Also, much appreciation to Martha A. Lane, Coordinator, Volunteer Literacy Aides Program, Lutheran Church Women, Lutheran Church in America, for involving us in PER I, recommending us for PER II, and helping us during the design phase of PER II.

The energy, effort, and time devoted to PER II by CSL personnel evidenced a depth of commitment to the evaluation enterprise far beyond that which we have previously experienced with other government bureaucracies. Gary E. Strong, State Librarian and Chief Executive Officer, California Library Services Board, deserves accolades for his dynamic and unflagging leadership of the California Literacy Campaign. Our sincere gratitude to: Nancy Percy, Assistant State Librarian, who played a key role in discussion and determination of the focus and scope of PER II; and to Cameron D. Robertson, CLSA Program Manager, for his invaluable input and assignment of staff to work on PER II. Thanks to Paul Kiley, Community Organization Specialist, for his important contributions with regard to CLC community development strategies and activities. Special thanks to Al Bennett, Literacy Specialist, for providing us with extensive background information on the Campaign, coordinating the activities necessary to secure the participation of local library literacy programs, and for thinking of us in the first place. Very special thanks to: Sandi L. Martin, CLSA Program Secretary, whose tireless efficiency got us through the first phases of PER II; and to Cy Silver, CLSA Planning and Evaluation Specialist, who picked us up where Sandi left off and provided detail, objectivity, and humor throughout the long and arduous draft review-and-revision process.

Of course, without the cooperation of the many CLC local library literacy program coordinators, PER II would not have been possible. Despite the late and rapid start-up of the evaluation, CLC program coordinators made every effort to get in as complete a list as possible of adult learners for the sample selection process and then to contact the adult learners and tutors selected for participation. The high percentage of responses from the learners and tutors selected was directly attributable to the efforts of the CLC program coordinators.

Most importantly, our gratitude and appreciation to the 104 adult learners and 99 tutors who took part in PER II. This report is in large measure about you, for most of the report is based on what you told us through your interviews and questionnaires. We are glad to be able to report that most adult learners are learning, which means that most tutors are teaching, and, as a result, that CLC is working. Hopefully, the results and recommendations of PER II will be used to further improve CLC program operations so as to better prepare tutors, reach and teach more adult learners (particularly from the lower socio-economic strata), and reduce functional illiteracy in the State of California. Certainly the program improvements made following PER I indicate that PER II will have a similar impact on the California Literacy Campaign.

Mark F. Wurzbacher
September 15, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD BY MARTHA A. LANE i

Executive Summary iii

Acknowledgements x

List of Appendices xviii

List of Tables xix

I. INTRODUCTION

A. How did the California Literacy Campaign begin? 1

B. What is the mission of the California Literacy Campaign? 2

C. What was the purpose and focus of Program Effectiveness Review I? 3

D. How does the purpose and focus of PER II differ from that of PER I? 3

E. What were the design and methodology used in PER II? 4

F. How is the report organized? 7

II. THE ADULT LEARNERS AND THEIR TUTORS

A. How were learners and tutors selected for participation in PER II? 8

B. How do characteristics of PER II learners compare with characteristics of PER I learners and with CLC learners who were active as of 12/31/85? 11

C. What were the characteristics of PER II learners? 16

1. Status in program 16

2. Gender/national origin/language spoken at home 16

3. Education 16

4. Previous adult education 17

5. Employment Status 17

6. Income 17

7. Living Arrangements 18

8. Hunter/Harmon groupings 18

D. How do characteristics of PER II tutors compare with characteristics of PER I tutors and CLC tutors who were active as of 12/31/85? 20

E. What were the characteristics of PER II tutors? 21

1. Status in the program 21

2. Gender/national origin/language spoken at home 25

3. Education 25

4. Employment Status 25

5. Income 26

6. Living arrangements 26

7. Volunteer vs. paid 26

F. To what extent are learners and tutors similar? 26

G. Summary and discussion 27

III. THE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

A. The Adult Learners' CLC Program Experience 29

1. How do learners first hear about the program? 29

2. Why do learners decide to get involved in the program? 30

3. How are learners matched with tutors? 31

4. What are the logistics of the learning situation? 31

5. To what extent do learners participate in the planning for tutoring? 31

6. To what extent are learners satisfied with their tutoring? 32

7. To what extent are learners active participants in the literacy program outside of tutoring? 32

8. To what extent are learners supported in their literacy program activities by family and friends? 33

B. The Tutors' CLC Program Experience 33

1. How do tutors first hear about the program? 33

2. Why do tutors decide to get involved in the program? 34

3. What training do tutors receive? 35

4. How are tutors matched with adult learners and what do tutors know about the learners? 36

5. What are the logistics of the tutoring situation? 36

6. What teaching methods and materials do tutors use? 37

7. To what extent do tutors report that learners participate in the planning for tutoring? 39

8. To what extent do tutors know about the support learners have for their literacy program activities? 40

9. To what extent are tutors satisfied with the tutoring experience? 40

10. To what extent are tutors active participants in the literacy program outside of tutoring? 41

C. Summary and Discussion of the Literacy Program Experience 42

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

A. Description of Service Outcomes 46

1. Has the literacy program helped learners as they thought it would? 46

2. What kinds of goals do learners set for themselves and what progress are they making in reaching them? 47

3. What can learners read and write as a result of having been in the literacy program? 49

4. What is the most significant way in which the literacy program has affected the lives of adult learners? 51

5. What changes have occurred in the lives of adult learners as a result of being in the literacy program? 52

6. Do adult learners make more use of the library since beginning with the literacy program? 54

B. Analysis of Service Outcomes 55

1. How were the functional literacy skills of adult learners measured? 55

2. Do results indicate that learners demonstrate improvement in functional literacy skills? 56

3. What relationship exists between learner and tutor assessments of functional literacy skills? 57

4. What relationship exists between the functional literacy skills a learner possesses prior to tutoring and the progress made as a result of tutoring? 57

5. What relationship exists between functional literacy skills improvement and some general characteristics of the learner? 57

6. What is the relationship between functional skills improvement and measures of learner empowerment? 60

7. What is the relationship between learner progress and learner reports of life changes? 61

C. Program Effectiveness Summary 62

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 65

A. Summary of PER II results 65

1. Is the population being served by CLC the population described in the mission statement? 65

2. As a result of participation in CLC programs, are learners able to read and write English well enough to handle the functional literacy demands they face in their daily lives? 66

3. Do all adult learners experience a sense of personal, familial and/or cultural enrichment and do they become more capable of pursuing educational and employment opportunities? 67

4. Do CLC instructional methods and materials address the functional literacy needs presented by the adults who participate in the programs? 68

5. Are local communities providing leadership, participation, support and funding for CLC programs? 68

B. Recommendations for Program Modifications 69

1. Clarify target population and modify program operations to better meet the needs of more skilled and less skilled learners 69

2. Develop and implement standard procedures for measuring and reporting adult learner progress 71

3. Improve tutor training in interpersonal communications, particularly in relation to goal setting with the adult learner 72

4. Increase the availability and utilization of supplementary instructional methods and materials. 73

5. Develop strategies for promoting greater adult learner participation in the leadership of literacy programs. 73

C. Recommendations for Future Evaluations 74

1. Conduct program effectiveness reviews on an annual basis and narrow the focus of each review 74

2. Objectively assess learner pre- and post-tutoring functional literacy skills and the impact of program participation on the learner's life situation. 75

3. For evaluations involving more than 25 respondents restrict the use of open-ended questions 75

4. Begin planning Program Effectiveness Review III twelve months prior to due date for final report. 76

REFERENCES 77

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Communities Served by the California Literacy Campaign

2. California Literacy Campaign Program Locations

3. California Literacy Campaign Contact List

4. California Literacy Campaign Update

5. Program Effectiveness Review II Adult Learner Interview Guide (with response compilations)

6. Program Effectiveness Review II Tutor Questionnaire (with response compilations)

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
II-1:	Program Status of PER I, CLC Second Quarter, and PER II Adult Learners	12
II-2:	Reason for Leaving Program for CLC Second Quarter and PER II Adult Learners	12
II-3:	Sex of PER I, CLC Second Quarter and PER II Adult Learners	13
II-4:	Age Groupings of PER I, CLC Second Quarter, and PER II Adult Learners	13
II-5:	Ethnicity of CLC Second Quarter and PER II Adult Learners	14
II-6:	Employment Status of PER I and PER II Adult Learners	14
II-7:	Years of Schooling of PER I and PER II Adult Learners	15
II-8:	Other Characteristics of PER I and PER II Adult Learners	15
II-9:	Sex of PER I, CLC Second Quarter and PER II Tutors	22
II-10:	Age Groupings of CLC Second Quarter and PER II Tutors	22
II-11:	Ethnicity of PER I, CLC Second Quarter, and PER II Tutors	23
II-12:	Employment Status of PER I and PER II Tutors	23
II-13:	Educational Level of PER I and PER II Tutors	24
II-14:	Other Characteristics of PER I and PER II Tutors	24
III-1:	How Adult Learners First Hear About the Literacy Program	29
III-2:	Adult Learner Reasons for Taking Reading and Writing Lessons	30
III-3:	How Tutors First Hear About the Literacy Program	34

III-4: Reasons for Becoming Tutor in the Literacy Program 34

III-5: Hours and Tutor Ratings of Initial Tutor Training 35

III-6: Information on Tutoring Logistics 37

III-7: Teaching Methods Used on a Regular Basis by Literacy program Tutors 38

III-8: Teaching Materials Used on a Regular Basis by Literacy Program Tutors 39

III-9: Most Important Way in Which Tutoring Has Affected Tutor's Life 40

III-10: Biggest Frustration or Greatest Disappointment of the Tutoring Experience 41

IV-1: How the Literacy Program Has Helped Adult Learners 46

IV-2: Goals Set by Adult Learners at the Onset of Tutoring 48

IV-3: What Learners Can Read or Write as a Result of Having Been in the Literacy Program 50

IV-4: Ways in Which the Program Has Had a Significant Impact on the Lives of Adult Learners 51

IV-5: Changes in the Lives of Adult Learners Resulting from Literacy Program Participation 52

IV-6: Changes in Adult Learner Educational Plans or Goals 53

IV-7: Changes in Adult Learner Job Situations or Plans 53

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents results from Program Effectiveness Review II (PER II) of the California Literacy Campaign (CLC). PER II is the second third-party evaluation conducted of the Campaign, a State-wide, community-oriented, library-based literacy program funded under the California Library Services Act. This chapter provides a brief history of the California Literacy Campaign and discussion of the CLC mission and the PER II methodology used to assess the Campaign's effectiveness. Appendices 1, 2 and 3 provide information on local program locations and contacts, and Appendix 4 provides an update on CLC program activities since Program Effectiveness Review I (PER I) was conducted in the Fall of 1984.

A. How did the California Literacy Campaign begin?

In September, 1983, State Librarian Gary E. Strong announced the commitment of $2.5 million in Federal funds, available on a one-time basis under the Library Services and Construction Act, for initiation of the California Literacy Campaign. All public libraries in the State were invited to apply for grants to develop local literacy programs. Following a supportive proclamation by Governor George Deukmejian in November, 1983, the State Librarian announced the awarding of grants to 27 libraries for initiation of local literacy programs (Phase I) during the last nine months of Federal fiscal year 1984 (October 1983 through September 1984). With legislative sponsorship by State Assemblyman Tom Bates of Oakland, this Campaign initiative was sustained for State fiscal year 1985 (July 1984 through June 1985) through an augmentation of the State budget allocation for the California Library Services Act. Consideration of CLC funding beyond FY85 was declared by the Governor to be dependent upon results of a program effectiveness review.

Program Effectiveness Review I was conducted by Martha A. Lane, Coordinator, Volunteer Reading Aides Program, of Lutheran Church Women of the Lutheran Church in America in the Fall of 1984, the results of which were reported to the California State Library and submitted for executive and legislative review in November of that year. Subsequently, an augmentation to the CSL budget permitted awarding of grants to an additional 18 city and county public libraries for the start-up of literacy projects beginning in January 1985 (Phase II). Three more libraries were awarded funds for the initiation of projects in July, 1985 (Phase III). The 1985/86 budget provided continuation funds in the amount of

$3.5 million for the 46 programs, serving 47 jurisdictions, that requested funds.

B. What is the mission of the California Literacy Campaign?

The mission of the CLC is related to the goal of the California Library Services Act. The Act has as its goal the equalization of access to informational resources by all citizens of the State. The various service programs authorized under CLSA can be separated into two major groups: those, such as interlibrary loan reimbursement and delivery, which are aimed at removing jurisdictional or geographic barriers to access; and those, such as the California Literacy Campaign, that are designed to remove personal barriers (in this case, the lack of basic reading skills) to access.

The California Literacy Campaign does not have a formal, concise mission statement. However, a mission statement can be readily developed from these documents: the enabling legislation, an undated California State Library news release entitled "California Literacy Campaign 1983-4"; and the "Guidelines for Applicants for California Literacy Campaign Participation 1986/87."

The PER II evaluators used those documents to formulate this mission statement for the CLC:

> The mission of the California Literacy Campaign is to develop and improve the basic functional literacy skills of persons aged 16 years and older who reside in the State of California, ordinarily speak English in their daily lives, and are not currently being served by other educational programs. Particular emphasis is to be given to serving those adults who have less than an eighth grade education, who have a family income below the poverty level, and for whom functional illiteracy presents a major barrier to upward mobility, in terms either of employment and/or quality of life.
>
> Campaign programs are to be operated by public libraries because literacy work relates to the library's purpose of enabling people to access information, ideas and literature. Library-operated literacy programs are a means to improve people's reading skills and thus their ability to access the library's resources.
>
> Programs must be designed to meet the functional literacy needs of the local adult population and therefore must draw on the local community for

leadership, participation, support, and funding of the literacy program. Instructional methods and materials are developed so as to address the functional literacy needs presented by the individual adults who participate in the program.

As a result of participation in these programs, individual adult learners will, at a minimum, be able to read and write English well enough to handle the functional literacy demands they face in their daily lives. Development and improvement of these basic skills will be accompanied by enhanced feelings of self-confidence and self-esteem, such that participants experience a sense of personal, familial and/or cultural enrichment and become more capable of pursuing educational and employment opportunities which will allow them to improve their quality of life. Such improvement will ultimately benefit and improve the quality of life of all those residing in the State of California.

C. What was the purpose and focus of Program Effectiveness Review I?

Program Effectiveness Review I was conducted in the Fall of 1984 by Martha A. Lane, with assistance from Jean F. McGuire and the PER II principals, Christine H. Yeannakis and Mark F. Wurzbacher. The purpose of PER I was to determine the extent to which CLC programs had met the operational goals and objectives set for their first six months of existence (e.g., numbers of participants, training sessions held, media contacts made.) As the programs were so new, there was little data available to determine the extent to which the functional literacy skills of adult learners had improved and, concomitantly, the extent to which such improvement had affected their lives. Thus, the focus of PER I was on the "program components" being developed to achieve these outcomes. The PER I findings provided considerable evidence for asserting that CLC had, in a relatively short period of time, been effective in reaching and initiating teaching with a considerable number of adult learners and that individual programs had accomplished this, by and large, in accordance with the program design principles established by the California State Library.

D. How does the purpose and focus of PER II differ from that of PER I?

In part, Program Effectiveness Review II has been conducted for much the same reason as PER I, that is, to measure achievement of program operation goals and objectives. However, the purpose of PER II extends beyond the purpose of

PER I, in that the California State Library now desires more detailed information as to just how effective the Campaign has been in meeting the outcome variables of its mission statement. Although PER II looks again at the program components addressed by PER I, the focus of PER II is upon the learners served by the local library literacy programs and the impact of that participation in these programs has had upon the skills and lives of these learners.

The purpose of PER II is to determine the extent to which CLC has been effective in carrying out its mission, the manner in which increased effectiveness may be achieved, and ways in which program effectiveness can be more accurately guaged in the future. Consequently, the principal questions addressed by the PER II evaluation are:

- To what extent were the functional literacy skills of adult learners improved by their participation in local library literacy programs?

- To what extent were the lives of adult learners enhanced by their participation in local library literacy programs?

Program components are examined primarily as they relate to learner participation and experience in local library literacy programs, most particularly the tutoring component, as this is the process variable most crucially linked to the desired service outcomes of skills improvement and life enhancement.

E. What were the design and methodology used in PER II?

With few exceptions, research and evaluation of volunteer adult literacy programs have focused on describing the degree to which programs have met operational objectives by reporting such information as number of participants, number of training sessions, number of tutoring hours, etc. These evaluations have been valuable in the development of models for effective program operation. However, scant attention has been given to answering the questions of whether participation in the program does indeed result in increased functional literacy and, if so, whether this skills improvement has any impact on the learner's life. Those research studies which have attempted to answer the first question have typically relied on instruments of questionable validity for the measurement of "functional literacy," there being little consensus in the field as to how to assess the "functional literacy" skills of adults or even as to what constitutes "functional literacy."

Some evaluation studies, such as PER I, have measured "client satisfaction" with exploratory probes as to tutor and learner perceptions of progress in skills development and related effects on the learner's life. PER II constitutes an extension of this type of naturalistic evaluation, with an increased emphasis on tutor and learner perceptions as to the outcomes of skills improvement and life enhancement. The design is unique in that it provides for the comparative examination and analysis of self-reports from matched learner/tutor pairs, that is, adult learners and the tutors who have been teaching them.

PER II utilizes a modification of the discrepancy evaluation[1] model utilized by Lane for PER I. This model compares program performance with the standards established by the program for performance, both as to process and as to outcomes. Performance standards of the California Literacy Campaign were determined by a review and interpretation of mission-related management information furnished by the California State Library, as summarized in preceding discussion of the CLC mission. Program performance data was collected from three principal sources, as follows:

Adult Learners. One hundred and four randomly selected adult learners were interviewed by telephone using the PER II Adult Learner Interview Guide (ALIG - see Appendix 5). The PER II ALIG is a revision of the Student Interview Guide developed by the PER II principals. Both Ms. Lane and CSL staff made contributions as to which questions to add, retain, delete, and modify. Ninety-eight of the learner interviews were conducted in English by three interviewers from the same California-based professional telephone survey company utilized in PER I. Six of the interviews were conducted in Spanish, at the request of the learners, by two bi-lingual Associates in California. Interviews were conducted between May 5 and June 6, 1986. (See "Chapter II: The Adult Learners and Their Tutors" for a discussion of sampling procedures.)

Tutors. A PER II Tutor Questionnaire (TQ) was sent to tutors of all those learners from whom participation agreements and contact information were received. Ninety-nine tutors returned the completed TQ, of whom 86 were tutors of learners who were interviewed. The PER II TQ is a revision of the Tutor Questionnaire developed by Lane for PER I, which was itself a modification of an earlier questionnaire developed by Wurzbacher and Yeannakis. Both Ms. Lane and CSL staff made

---

[1] Provus, Malcolm M. Discrepancy Evaluation. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing, 1971.

contributions as to which questions to add delete, retain, and modify. Questionnaires were completed during late May and early June of 1986.

California State Library. The California State Library provided organizational information, including: summary program statistics from 1985/86 second quarter reports submitted by the local library literacy programs on CSL/CLC reporting forms; summary reports of various aspects of CLC program operations; various press releases and information sheets developed and utilized by CSL in promoting CLC; and responses to inquiries by the evaluators.

Data were compiled and categorized for each interview and questionnaire response item, the results of which are reported in Attachments 5 and 6. Following data compilation and categorization, descriptive statistical procedures were employed for preliminary analysis of the variables and discovery of relationships among them. Alternative hypotheses were formulated for explanation of these relationships and additional statistical procedures were utilized to reach final interpretations of the results in relation to the evaluation questions asked. These interpretations form the basis of the recommendations made for future conduct of the California Literacy Campaign.

Generalization of the results of PER II to the California Literacy Campaign as a whole is constrained by at least two major sources of probable statistical bias, the first being derivative from the means by which the sample was selected, discussed fully in Chapter II. The second source of bias is derivative from the retrospective nature of the data collection procedures. Both learners and tutors were first being asked to recall thoughts, feelings, competencies, activities, and other information from the beginnings of their tutoring/learning experience and, shortly thereafter, asked to give information on the same topics from their present perspectives. The indeterminable bias introduced by the use of such data is that recollections of the past may lack detail and accuracy and be reinterpreted in light of subsequent experiences and present thoughts and feelings on the subjects in question. The comparison of responses from learners and their tutors was, in part, an attempt to reduce this bias, for learner/tutor agreement lends increased validity to the responses.

The other problem involved in using this retrospective data is that it compares learner/tutor pairs as if they began tutoring at the same point in time, thereby introducing temporal factors as an unknown bias. However, given the focus of the evaluation and the fact that most of the PER II

learners and tutors had been studying together for less than a year, the bias in this case is probably not extensive.

The data reported in the following chapters is thus more qualitative and speculative than quantitative and definitive. However, as a reflection of what tutors and learners reported to be their thoughts and feelings about the learning experience, the data provides a satisfactory basis for fulfilling the purposes of PER II.

F. How is the report organized?

PER II results are presented in the following three chapters. Chapter II describes the learners and tutors who participated in the evaluation study. Chapter III presents descriptive information on the tutoring experience from both learner and tutor perspectives. Chapter IV, which constitutes the heart of the report, presents descriptive and analytical information on learner skills improvement and life enhancement outcomes. Chapter V summarizes the results of PER II and provides recommendations for program modifications and future evaluations.

II. THE ADULT LEARNERS AND THEIR TUTORS

This chapter presents a description of the 104 learners and 99 tutors who participated in Program Effectiveness Review II (PER II), 86 of whom were matched learner/tutor pairs. The chapter includes an overview of the learner sampling procedure and discussion of a probable bias in the resulting sample of learners. PER II learners and tutors are compared to the California Literacy Campaign (CLC) adult learner and tutor populations in relation to program status, sex, age, and ethnicity. Certain demographic and program characteristics of the PER II learners and tutors are also compared to PER I learners and tutors.

A. How were learners and tutors selected for participation in PER II?

A sample of one hundred learners and a replacement sample of an additional one hundred learners were randomly selected by the evaluators from among the learners in the 45 local library literacy programs that agreed to participate in PER II. The sample universe was made up of 3,784 learners listed by the 45 programs in response to a CSL request to each program for a list of all learners reported as receiving instruction during the second quarter of FY86.

Second quarter reports submitted by the 45 programs indicated that these programs served 5,414 learners during the period, 1,630 learners more than listed by the literacy programs for this evaluation. There are several factors that probably contributed to this discrepancy. First, one of the programs reporting a large number of learners to CSL at the end of the second quarter subsequently changed its data collection and reporting system so as to provide more accurate information in this regard. This change, which occurred between the due date of the second quarter report and the submission of learner lists for PER II sample selection, resulted in about 1,000 learners being dropped from the literacy program's rolls.

A second factor contributing to the discrepancy was the short time period available for program staff to compile lists of second quarter active clients for use in PER II sample selection. Several programs are de-centralized and operate out of multiple sites. Client records are kept at these sites by staff who are generally part-time and sometimes volunteers. Compilation of lists proved to be both difficult and time-consuming. Thus, many programs provided only

partial listings rather than none at all for the sake of the evaluation process.

A third factor was some apparent confusion among program staff as to which learners to list. The evaluation instructions asked for a list of each learner who received services during the second quarter. However, as lists were compiled, staff often omitted the names of learners who were no longer active and/or for whom contact information was no longer available. These learners, however, would have been incorporated in the second quarter count.

The fourth and final possible contributing factor is a general problem with information management. CLS staff report that most programs do not use microcomputers to maintain a participant database. Record keeping may be, and justifiably so, a low priority for low-budget, service-oriented literacy programs.

The random samples drawn resulted in adult learners being selected for either the original or replacement sample groups from 39 of the 45 CLC programs. Programs were then asked to approach these 200 learners to explain the purpose of the study and to secure their written agreement to participate if called upon to be interviewed. Programs then were asked to send the written participation agreement directly to the evaluators along with the name and telephone number of the learner and the name and address of his/her tutor. The evaluators received agreements and complete learner/tutor contact information for 117 of the 200 adult learners selected to the two samples. Although not requested to do so, some programs gave reasons for not sending agreements and/or information on 45 of the adult learners, as follows:

Program unable to secure permission agreement	- 17
Learner no longer in program/moved/etc.	- 8
Learner declined to participate	- 7
Learner's phone disconnected	- 3
Learner on vacation	- 3
Learner has no tutor	- 3
Learner in prison	- 2
Learner has health problems	- 1
Wrong match provided by program	- 1

As for the other 38 selected learners for whom agreements and information were not received, no specific reasons were given. However, in at least two cases, programs reported to CSL that some learners selected did not want to participate for fear of discovery of their status as "illegal aliens."

With information on only 117 adult learners and the expectation that some of these would be lost during the interview process, interviewers were instructed to contact and review as many of these learners as possible. A total of 104 adult learners were interviewed between May 5 and June 6, 1986, including 65 from the original sample and 39 from the replacement sample. Of the 13 learners not interviewed, 7 had telephone numbers which had been disconnected and one had moved; interviewers were never able to establish contact with the other five.

Tutors were selected after the adult learners had been selected to maximize the possibility of securing the participation of tutors of the learners to be interviewed. (Thus, the tutor sample was not intended to be representative of the CLC tutor population.) Questionnaires were sent out at the beginning of May, 1986, to tutors of the 116 learners from whom permission agreements and learner/ tutor contact information had been received. (One learner was awaiting a new tutor at the time of the evaluation.) Ninety-nine tutors returned the completed questionnaire by the extended deadline of June 23, 1986. Eighty-six of these were tutors of learners who had been interviewed.

In summary, 1,630 adult learners and their tutors were screened out of possible PER II participation because for some unknown reason the adult learners were not included in the sample universe. Of the 200 learners who were selected for possible participation, only 7 refused, but another 76 were screened out by programs for a variety of reasons, nearly half of which are unknown. The major bias in the sampling procedure is the non-representation of adult learners who have become "physically inaccessible," that is, learners who left the program either because they moved or for some other reason, such as death or going to prison.

It should not be construed that the programs were remiss in carrying out their sampling procedure responsibilities. To the contrary, library literacy programs are to be highly commended for their cooperation and participation in the sample selection process, for without them the selection process would not have been possible.

B. How do characteristics of PER II learners compare with characteristics of PER I learners and with CLC learners who were active as of 12/31/85?

As illustrated in Table II-1, the PER II sample was similar to the PER I sample and fairly representative of CLC second quarter learners[2] with respect to the percentage of learners receiving tutoring. The PER II sample was also fairly representative of the CLC second quarter learners with respect to the percentage who had left the program. (The PER I sample, of course, picked up few such learners, as most of the programs had just begun at the time.)

When looking at learners who had left their programs (Table II-2), the percentage of PER II learners leaving for "positive" reasons was slightly smaller than that for CLC second quarter learners. In relation to CLC learners who had left their programs for other reasons, the PER II sample contained a disproportionate number of "drop-outs" and none of those who would have been reported as having become "physically inaccessible." The latter, of course, were "screened out" by the sampling procedures, as discussed earlier.

As illustrated in Table II-3, the PER I and PER II samples were similar with respect to sex, and the PER II sample was fairly representative of CSL second quarter learners in this regard as well (all about 50% male and 50% female). With respect to age (Table II-4), the PER II sample was somewhat older than CLC second quarter learners, there being proportionately fewer learners aged 16 to 29 (28.8% to 37.8%), about the same proportions aged 30 to 49 (50.0% to 49.6%), and proportionately more aged 50 and older (21.1% to 12.6%). Finally, with respect to ethnicity (Table II-5), the PER II sample, when compared with CLC second quarter learners, was proportionately more white and black (41.3% to 34.9% and 21.2% to 14.2%, respectively), with proportionately fewer Asians and Hispanics (5.8% to 11.5% and 26.9% to 35.0%, respectively).[3]

---

[2]"CLC second quarter learners" refer to learners for whom programmatic and demographic information was reported by the 46 local library literacy programs for the second quarter of Fiscal Year 1986 (October 1 to December 31, 1985). These learners were still receiving instruction on December 31. No demographic information was available on those who left during the quarter.

[3]Despite using slightly different age groupings, it appears as if the PER I sample had considerably more learners in the 30 to 39 age group and less in the older groups. PER I did not report on learner ethnicity.

Table II-1: Program Status of PER I (Fall 1984), CLC Second Quarter (FY86) and PER II Adult Learners (May 1986)

	PER I*	CLC	PER II
Currently being tutored	81%	79.9%	77.9%
Awaiting new tutor (previously tutored)	-	-	1.0%
No longer in program	6%	20.1%	21.2%
	(n=93)	(n=7,062)**	(n=104)

*PER I sample included 12 prospective learners (13%) who were awaiting their first tutor - such persons not included in PER II sample universe.
**Number of adult learners receiving second quarter instruction.

Table II-2: Reason for Leaving Program for CLC Second Quarter (FY86) and PER II Adult Learners (May 1986)

	CLC	PER II
"Met goal" ["those who met their own goals... or left the program for positive reasons"]	13.1%	9.1%
"Became physically inaccessible" ["those... who (for example) moved away, became incarcerated, or died"]	60.9%	-
"Other" ["those who 'dropped out' of the program, including those who left stating no reason or that they did not benefit from the program"]	25.7% (n=1,421)	90.9% (n=22)

Table II-3: Sex of PER I (Fall 1984), CLC Second Quarter (FY86), and PER II (May 1986) Adult Learners

	PER I	CLC*	PER II
Male	49%	50.8%	48.1%
Female	51%	49.2%	51.9%
	(n=90)	(n=5,304)	(n=104)

*Learners still receiving instruction as of December 31, 1986. No demographic information was available on learners who left program during the quarter.

Table II-4: Age Groupings of PER I (Fall 1984), CLC Second Quarter (FY86), and PER II (May 1986) Learners

	PER I*	CLC**	PER II
16 to 19 years	1%	6.7%	1.9%
20 to 29 years	28%	31.1%	26.9%
30 to 39 years	45%	31.1%	33.7%
40 to 49 years	13%	18.5%	16.3%
50 to 65 years	12%	9.6%	16.3%
Over 65 years	1%	3.0%	4.8%
	(n=90)	(n=5,277)	(n=104)

*PER I use age categories of less than 20, 21 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, 51 to 65, and over 65
**Adult learners receiving instruction at end of second quarter only (no demographic data available on those who left during quarter).

Table II-5: Ethnicity of CLC Second Quarter and PER II Adult Learners*

	CLC**	PER II
White	34.9%	41.3%
Asian	11.5%	5.8%
Hispanic	35.0%	26.9%
Black	14.2%	21.2%
Native American	1.1%	1.0%
Pacific Islander	0.9%	1.9%
Other	2.4%	1.9%
	(n=5,233)	(n=104)

*PER I did not report on learner ethnicity
**Adult learners receiving instruction at end of second quarter only (no demographic data available on those who left during quarter.)

Table II-6: Employment Status of PER I and PER II Adult Learners

	PER I	PER II
Employed*	53%	63.4%
Retired	3%	6.7%
Not employed	40%	29.8%**
Other	4%	-
	(n=93)	(n=104)

*For PER I, "most" employed full-time - for PER II, 77.3% full-time and 22.7% part-time.
**6 job-hunting, 2 work-related disabilities, and 23 homemakers

Table II-7: Years of Schooling of PER I and PER II Adult Learners

	PER I	PER II
Less than fifth grade	11%	12.3%
Fifth to eighth grade	13%	19.4%
Ninth to eleventh grade	25%	30.6%
Completed twelfth grade or received GED	41%	33.6%
Some college	10%	4.1%
	(n=90)	(n=98)

Table II-8: Other Characteristics of PER I and PER II Adult Learners

	PER I	PER II
Married	61%	67.3%
Primary wage earner in household	51%	44.1%
Speak English at home	73%	78.5%
	(n=93)	(n=104)
Receiving public financial assistance	25%	24.0%
	(n=90)	(n=100)

Tables II-6 through II-8 provide comparative information on PER I and PER II learners with respect to six other demographic characteristics. In comparison to the PER I sample, the PER II sample had a higher proportion of married persons (67.3% to 61%). More of the PER II learners were employed (63.4% to 53%), but less were the primary wage earners in their households (44.1% to 51%). The PER II sample had fewer high school graduates (37.7% to 51%), but about the same proportion of persons receiving public financial assistance (24.0% to 25%). As in the PER I sample, about three-quarters of the PER II sample lived in English-speaking households.

C. What were the characteristics of PER II learners?

1. Status in program: The 104 learners who participated in PER II represented 31 of the 45 CLC local library literacy programs which provided the learner lists from which the samples were drawn. Eighty-one were receiving tutoring at the time they were interviewed. Of those who were not receiving tutoring, one was awaiting a new tutor. Of the 22 who had left the program, two had, as one said, "finished the course." Of the other 20, all of whom still lived within proximity of their programs, three had left because they had become sick or disabled and seven had left for work-related reasons (got a job, change in work schedule, or change in work hours). Five gave no reason for having left the program. Overall, learners reported participating in the program for an average of 6 months. Length of participation ranged from less than a month to 18 months.

2. Gender/national origin/language spoken at home: Fifty four of the adult learners were female. Sixty-three of the PER II learners were between 20 and 39 years of age, with another 34 aged 40 to 65 years. Forty-three of the learners were white, 28 Hispanic, 22 black, and 6 Asian. Of the 99 learners reporting their place of birth, 73 were born in the United States, 12 in Mexico, 4 in China or Taiwan, 3 in other Asian countries, 4 in Pacific island locations, 2 in Caribbean island locations, and one in Europe. Eighty-four learners reported that the language they speak at home is English, three said Chinese, and fourteen said Spanish. (Six learners requested that they be interviewed in Spanish.)

3. Education: Thirty-one of the PER II learners had less than a 9th grade education, while 37 had either completed the 12th grade or received a general education diploma. Fourteen of the learners reported having received vocational training in high school, and 45 reported

having been in special education at some time during their childhood schooling. The latter included 37 individuals who had at one time or another been in remedial reading groups and classes, including 18 who had remedial instruction in other subject areas as well. Another 6 persons had been in classes or schools for children labeled as "slow learners," "learning disabled," or "educationally handicapped."

4. Previous adult education: Since leaving school, 41 PER II learners had been involved in other adult programs in which they had worked on reading and writing skills. These included 28 persons who were apparently in adult basic education programs, 4 who had been in ESL classes, and 3 who had been in other volunteer basic literacy programs. Five learners reported "positive" outcomes from these previous adult education experiences. Of the 36 others, 21 reported more "negative" outcomes and having left the programs for reasons related either to what was taught, how it was taught, or both. Fifteen learners reported themselves to be part-time students at the time of the study, five were going to college and one to trade school, while the others were referring to their participation in the literacy program.

5. Employment Status: Sixty-six of the PER II learners said they were employed, 51 full-time and 15 part-time, with four of the latter looking for full-time employment. Nineteen of these persons were working in agricultural or unskilled jobs, and 30 performed skilled or semi-skilled labor. Five were in clerical or sales jobs and 11 were in semi-professional, professional, management, or ownership positions. Forty worked in small businesses or local industrial, franchise or service operations, nine in the public sector (government, military, university, or public schools), five for national or regional corporations, and six for either private individuals or themselves. Seven learners were retired, of whom two had run their own businesses, one had been in sales, two had held skilled/semi-skilled labor positions, and two had worked in unskilled jobs. Of PER II learners who were neither employed nor retired, six were looking for jobs and had applied for such in the preceding month, while two were out of jobs due to work-related disabilities and 23 reported themselves to be homemakers.

6. Income: Forty-five of the PER II learners reported themselves to be the primary wage earner in their households. Of the 61 PER II learners reporting their annual household income, seven reported less than $10,000; twenty from $10,000 to $19,999; and twelve from $20,000 to $29,999; twenty-two learners reported annual

household incomes equal to or greater than $30,000. Twenty-four adult learners were receiving some form of financial assistance from the government, including nine persons on welfare, four receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), four receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), two receiving disability benefits, and one each receiving unemployment and food stamps.

7. Living Arrangements: Seventy of the PER II learners were married, and the average number of persons living in each learner's household was four. Fifty learners lived with their spouse and offspring, while 12 headed single-parent households with their children. Of the 42 other learners, 17 lived with their spouse, 8 with their parents, 6 with other relations, 6 by themselves, 4 with friends, and one in a rescue mission.

8. Hunter/Harmon groupings: Finally, the PER II learners were given socio-economic-educational classifications derived from those developed by Hunter and Harmon and detailed in CSL "Guidelines for Applicants for California Literacy Campaign Participation 1986/7," as follows:

   Group 1: "People 'who share most fully the values of the dominant cultural group within the U.S.;' dropped out of school for personal reasons...; learn on their own or through occasional classes; generally employed; families and others around them usually finished high school; are upwardly mobile. They tend to be 'embarrassed by not having a high school diploma and find this the most significant barrier to self-esteem and job advancement.' They can succeed in most GED programs and are not so afraid of learning in a classroom situation. The California Literacy Campaign generally addresses the needs of this group by means of referrals to GED or other local educational services."

   Group 2: "People having 'far more serious educational deficiencies;' left school earlier than Group 1 types, some can't read or write at all; socialize in groups in which literacy is assumed; spouses may be literate; jobs may require more reading skills than they possess; live in constant fear that their illiteracy will be discovered; often can be reached through intensive recruitment campaigns; 'overcoming their difficulties causes such dramatic changes in their personal lives that they speak of the change almost as though it were a religious conversion.' Many of the CLC learners are within this group."

   Group 3: "People for whom reading is one of many major problems; live in inner-city or rural poverty areas; most

left school because they were failing academically; if they do try Adult Basic Education programs, they often fail again; job-training programs are more attractive to them than traditional schooling; some persevere, hoping for a change to their situation. Serving this group is a high priority for the CLC."

Group 4: "Generally hopeless about their future--'having largely given up believing that anything they can do will make a difference in their overall situations; out of sight and mind of the cultural majority; feel powerless, trapped. This is the most challenging group to reach and serve."

The reason for attempting to classify the PER II sample into these groupings was to ascertain the extent to which CLC is reaching adults in Group III. This group has recently been given special emphasis in the CLC mission statement as it includes functionally illiterate people sometimes referred to as the "harder to reach, harder to teach," who heretofore have seldom been participants in adult literacy programs.

As no one has previously operationalized the four Hunter-Harmon groupings according to specific demographic characteristics, the evaluators devised their own rough method for doing so. The principal criterion used was learner level of education. Additional criteria utilized were indicators of socio-economic status, including: employment status; occupational type; annual salary; receipt of public financial assistance; household wage earner status; and/or household size and annual income.

Of the 31 PER II learners with less than a ninth grade education, 21 were classified as Group II learners because they also met one or two of the following criteria:

- Receiving public financial assistance (welfare, AFDC, SSI, disability, unemployment, food stamps, and/or medical assistance)
- Unemployed and either primary wage earner in household or disabled
- Employed in agricultural or unskilled labor
- Living in household in which annual household income averages out to less than $4,000 per person living in the household

Two persons were classified as Group III adult learners based on the fact that they had less than a fifth-grade education and met two of the other socio-economic status criteria. A third individual was classified as a Group III learner based on his having less than a ninth grade education and meeting three of the additional criteria.

The other 80 persons in the PER I sample were classified as Group I adult learners. However, a number do not seem to fit the Hunter-Harmon characteristics profile in this regard, particularly those with high school diplomas who hold professional or management positions and/or report household incomes of more than $30,000 per year.

These groupings were made for the purposes of analysis, the results of which should only be taken as suggestive in nature as the evaluators are unaware of any previous attempts to operationalize the Hunter-Harmon "character profiles" of the four groups of illiterate adults. Moreover, in most individual cases, information as to the non-educational socio-economic status indicators was incomplete, and no information was secured as to the job type of the primary wage earner when he or she was other than the adult learner.

D. How do characteristics of PER II tutors compare with characteristics of PER I tutors and CLC tutors who were active as of 12/31/85?

In looking at the PER II tutors, it is to be remembered that it was not intended to be either a representative sampling of the CLC tutor population or a basis for generalization to CLC tutors as a whole. Rather, the tutors were selected based on the random selection of their learners to the PER II adult learner sample. The resulting bias is evident in comparing the program status of the PER II tutors and the CLC second quarter tutors.[5] Of the 4,615 tutors who instructed during the second quarter, 508 (or 11.0%) left the program during the quarter. Of the PER II tutors, although 17 (17.2%) were not tutoring at the time of the study, ten said they were awaiting a new student. Of the other seven, only 4 (or 4.0% of the entire sample) had actually left the program, all for tutor-related reasons. Still, it should be noted that when

---

[5] "CLC second quarter tutors" refer to tutors for whom participation and demographic information was reported by the 46 local library literacy programs for the second quarter of Fiscal Year 1986 (October 1 through December 31, 1985).

asked how much longer they planned to work as tutors, 27.2% of those responding (n=92) said they either did not know or were not sure.

As illustrated in Table II-9, the PER II tutor sample was similar to the PER I tutor sample with respect to sex, but contained proportionately more females when compared to the CLC second quarter tutor population. With regard to age (Table II-10), the PER II tutors were somewhat older than the CLC second quarter tutors, there being proportionately fewer tutors aged 16 to 29 (9.2% to 14.7%) and 30 to 49 (37.4% to 41.4%) and proportionately more tutors aged 50 years and over (53.5% to 43.9%). (PER I used different age categories to group tutors.)

Finally, the PER I and II samples were relatively similar with respect to ethnicity, but the PER II sample was proportionately more white than the CLC second quarter tutor population (87.6% to 80.1%) and proportionately less black (4.1% to 8.2%), with about the same proportions of Asians and Hispanics. (See Table II-11.)

Tables II-12 through II-14 provide comparative information on PER I and PER II tutors with respect to four other demographic characteristics. In comparison to the PER I sample, the PER II sample had higher proportions of married persons (65.3% to 56%) and primary wage earners (51.5% to 47%). The PER II sample was considerably more educated than the PER I sample, particularly in relation to those with advanced degrees (46.0% to 18%). Yet, the PER II sample had proportionately less tutors who were employed (44.4% to 49%). With respect to annual household income, it was not possible to compare the groups because the non-response to this item was so much higher for the PER II sample (30.3%) than it was for the PER I sample (12.5%).

E. What were the characteristics of PER II tutors?

1. Status in the program: The 99 tutors who participated in PER II represented 32 of the 45 CLC local library literary programs which provided the learner lists from which the learner samples were drawn. All participating tutors had tutored in a literacy program and each reported on an adult learner selected for the PER II samples. Eighty-six of the selected learners had a tutor who returned a questionnaire. Thus, there were 86 matched learner/tutor pairs. Of these 86, 75 pairs had had 10 or more tutoring sessions together.

   Eighty-two of the tutors were tutoring at the time they completed the PER II Tutor Questionnaire. Of the 17 who

Table II-9: Sex of PER I (Fall 1984), CLC Second Quarter (FY86)and PER II (May 1986) Tutors

	PER I	CLC	PER II
Male	9%	19.9%	12.1%
Female	91%	80.1%	87.9%
	(n=106)	(n=4,109)	(n=99)

Table II-10: Age Groupings of CLC Second Quarter and PER II Tutors

	CLC	PER II
16 to 19 years	1.4%	-
20 to 29 years	13.3%	9.1%
30 to 39 years	22.7%	19.2%
40 to 49 years	18.7%	18.2%
50 to 65 years	26.2%	34.3%
Over 65 years	17.7%	19.2%
	(n=4,078)	(n=99)

Table II-11: Ethnicity of PER I, CLC Second Quarter, and PER II Tutors

	PER I	CLC	PER II
White	84%	80.1%	87.6%
Asian	4%	2.2%	2.1%
Hispanic	7%	6.4%	5.2%
Black	5%	8.2%	4.1%
Native American	-	0.6%	1.0%
Pacific Islander	-	0.6%	-
Other	-	2.1%	-
	(n=106)	(n=4,105)	(n=97)

Table II-12: Employment Status of PER I (Fall 1984) and PER II (May 1986) Tutors

	PER I	PER II
Employed	49%	44.4%
Retired	32%	36.4%
Not Employed	7%	15.2%
Other	12%	4.0%
	(n=104)	(n=99)

Table II-13: Educational Level of PER I and PER II Tutors

	PER I	PER II
Less than ninth grade	-	-
Ninth to eleventh grade	6%	2.0%
High school diploma/GED	6%	13.3%
Some college (no degree)	39%	2.0%
Bachelor's degree	37%	36.7%
Master's degree	16%	37.8%
Doctorate	2%	8.2%
	(n=106)	(n=98)

Table II-14: Other Characteristics of PER I and PER II Tutors

	PER I	PER II
Married	56%	65.3%
	(n=106)	(n=98)
Primary wage earner in household	47%	51.5%
	(n=95)	(n=99)

were not tutoring at the time of the study, ten said they were waiting for new adult learners, all but two of whom had been waiting less than a month. As a group, these 17 tutors gave 18 reasons for having ceased work with their most recent adult learners, two of which related to "positive" learner outcomes and two of which related to a "temporary halt" in the tutoring. Seven reasons given related to the learner (got a job/scheduling conflicts/lack of interest), and seven reasons given related to the tutor (personal problems/burn-out/moved.) Those who gave learner-related reasons, either "positive" or otherwise, were much more likely to have indicated that they were awaiting a new learner.

2. Gender/national origin/language spoken at home: Eighty-seven of the 99 PER II tutors were female. All but nine tutors were over the age of thirty, with 53 being 50 years of age or older. Eighty-five of the tutors were white, 91 were born in the United States, and all but one lived in English-speaking households.

3. Education: All but two tutors had graduated from high school or secured a G.E.D. Eighty-three had gone on to college, all but two of whom had secured degrees, including 45 who had earned advanced degrees. Twenty-two reported themselves to be students at the time of the study, most of whom were going to college or university, four on a full-time basis.

4. Employment Status: Forty-four tutors said they were employed, 25 full-time and 19 part-time, the latter of which included two persons looking for full-time work. Twenty-six held professional, semi-professional, management, or ownership positions, 11 worked in clerical or sales jobs, five were in skilled or semi-skilled occupations, one was in an unskilled job, and one did not report what s/he did. Twenty-eight worked in the public sector, either for local or state government or a state university or public school system. Two worked for major national corporations, five were self-employed, and nine worked in small business or local industrial, service, or franchise operations.

   Thirty-six of the tutors were retired, 24 from either professional occupations or managerial positions in large firms. Four of the tutors were full-time college or university students. Of tutors who were neither employed nor retired nor going to school full-time, four were looking for work and had applied for jobs in the preceding month, and 11 reported themselves to be homemakers.

5. Income: Fifty-one of the tutors reported themselves to be the primary wage earners in their households. Of the 69 tutors reporting annual household income, seven reported less than $10,000, nine from $10,000 to $19,999, and 22 from $20,000 to $29,999; thirty-one reported annual household incomes of $30,000 or more. Thirty-two of the tutors reported receiving public financial assistance, 20 in the form of social security. Three were receiving SSI, one was on welfare, one was receiving AFDC, three were receiving rental supplements, and three were receiving disability benefits.

6. Living arrangements: Sixty-four of the PER II tutors were married, and the average number of persons in each tutor's household was just over two. Twenty were living in households with their spouse and children, while five were heading up single-parent households with their children. Of the 51 other household living arrangements reported on by tutors, 42 lived with their spouse, four with their father and/or mother, two with other relations, one with friends, one with his fiancee, and one by herself.

7. Volunteer vs. paid: Ninety of the tutors were volunteers, and nine were paid staff. On the average, tutors had been with the literacy programs one year, with paid tutors having two-and-a-half more months of time-in-service than volunteer tutors. On the average, volunteer tutors had taught two adult learners and tutored for 100 hours, while paid tutors had taught 18 learners and tutored 276 hours. All but one paid tutor had program experience teaching in either small group and/or classroom settings, while only eight of the volunteer tutors had such program experience.

F. To what extent are learners and tutors similar?

The PER II learner and tutor groups were fairly similar with respect to marital and primary wage earner status. As in PER I, however, there were striking differences between the PER II learner and tutor groups in relation to most demographic characteristics, as follows:

	Learners	Tutors
Sex:	Male - 48.1%	Female - 87.9%
Age:	Under 40 - 62.5%	over 39 - 71.7%
Ethnicity:	Ethnic minority - 58.7%	Caucasian - 87.6%
Education:	> 12th grade - 62.3%	College degree - 82.7%
Employment status:	Employed - 63.4%	Employed - 44.4%
	Retired - 6.7%	Retired - 36.4%
Occupation (employed and retired):		
	Skilled/semi-skilled/ unskilled - 72.6%	Owner/manager/ Professional/semi-professional - 66.3%

G. Summary and discussion

Comparison of the demographic characteristics of the PER I and PER II adult learner samples show them to be similar with respect to active program status, sex, marital status, receipt of public assistance, speaking English at home, and primary wage earner status (all percentage differences of less than seven per cent). With regard to age, the only large difference between the two samples (above seven percent) was in the group of learners aged 30 to 39 years, of which the PER I sample had proportionately more (about 11%). The PER II sample had proportionately more learners who were employed (just over 10%). The largest difference between the two samples was in relation to learners' education: whereas 51% of the PER I sample had graduated from high school, only 37.7% of the PER II sample had done so, with the difference being about equally split between greater proportions of PER II learners in the 5th-to-8th and 9th-to-11th grade groupings. To the extent that the randomly-selected PER II learner sample was representative of the CLC learner universe from which it was drawn, these comparisons may mean that CLC has, in the past year and a half, attracted more employed but less educated adult learners.

The PER I evaluators had no sample universe characteristics with which to compare its learner sample. However, as a result of CSL implementation of the PER I recommendation for development of a format and guidelines for gathering data, the PER II evaluators were able to compare their sample with

the CSL learner universe from which it was drawn. With respect to program status, the percentage of "active" learners (those receiving instruction) was quite close (within two percent), as was the percentage of learners who had "met goals" (within four percent). However, among "other" learners who had left their programs, the PER II sample had a substantial overrepresentation of "drop-outs". The CSL universe and the PER II sample from which it was drawn were similar with regard to sex, but the PER II sample contained a somewhat lesser proportion of adolescents and young adults (9%) and a somewhat greater proportion of senior citizens (about 9%). In relation to ethnicity, the PER II sample drew a somewhat larger proportion of whites and blacks (6-7%) and a somewhat smaller proportion of Asians and Hispanics (6-8%).

The CLC demographic data was for learners who were receiving instruction as of December 31, 1985, whereas the PER II demographic data was for a sample of these learners drawn five months later, a number of whom had since either "graduated," "faded out," or "dropped out." Generalization of the results and findings from this evaluation study with regard to all CLC adult learners must be tempered by the fact that implementation of the sampling procedure screened out a considerable number of potential adult learner participants, most noticeably those who have "faded out," sometimes because they have moved, often for unknown reasons. Still, given the relative similarity of the CLC second quarter and PER II learners, at least with respect to age, sex, and ethnicity, and the exploratory nature of the evaluation design, there appears to be some basis for accepting the results and findings of this report as being suggestive of the effect and impact that CLC local library literacy programs have had upon the adult learners who have participated in them.

III. THE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary description of the program experiences of the 104 adult learners and 99 tutors who participated in Program Effectiveness Review II (PER II), with comparisons, when available, to the program experiences of the PER I adult learners and tutors. Summary discussion cites the fact that CLC programs have become adept at carrying out the four program components of recruiting, training, matching and tutoring to the satisfaction of most learners and tutors, but reaffirms the issue raised in PER I with respect to the nature and degree of learner involvement in determining program direction, both on a personal basis and/or on an organizational level.

A. The Adult Learners' CLC Program Experience

1. How do learners first hear about the program?

As indicated in Table III-1, two-thirds of the PER III adult learners' first heard about the literacy program either through the broadcast media or from people close to them in their lives. The other most frequently cited initial informational source was the library. These responses are quite similar to those of the PER I adult learners, although "word-of-mouth" (family/friends) accounts for a slightly larger percentage of the PER II responses, perhaps reflecting the fact that there are more people who know about CLC programs now than knew a year and a half ago.

Table III-1: How Adult Learners First Hear About the Literary Program

	PER I	PER II
Television	27%	23.5%
Radio	5%	11.8%
Family members	15%	12.6%
Friends	11%	19.3%
Library	10%	12.6%
Other	32%	20.2%
(number of responses)	(NR)	(119)

2. Why do learners decide to get involved in the program?

The 104 PER II learners gave 345 reasons for having decided to take reading and writing lessons. Table III-2 lists each of those reasons given by more than 15% of the adult learners. As can be seen, nearly three-quarters wanted to improve their reading skills. Improved writing and spelling were the other two reasons most frequently cited by learners. Improving one's self, job situation, educational qualifications, and English capabilities were each also mentioned by a significant minority of the learners.

Table III-2: Adult Learner Reasons for Taking Reading and Writing Lessons

	Percentage of Learners Listing as a Reason
Improve my reading skills	69.2%
Improve my writing skills	42.3%
Improve my spelling skills	36.5%
Improve myself	26.0%
Get a job or get a new job	24.0%
Further my education	19.2%
Learn to speak and/or converse in English	17.3%
Did not learn in school/want to try again	15.4%

To the question of what they had hoped to get out of the literacy program when they started, the PER II learners gave 296 responses. Learner expectations generally matched their reasons for coming into the program; for example, 64.4% of the learners hoped for improved reading skills, 39.4% for improved writing skills, 25.9% for improved spelling skills, and so on. In some cases, learners elaborated upon these most frequently cited expectations, as 20% of the 296 responses referenced personal reading or writing goals, that is, specific materials the learner hoped to be able to read or specific writing tasks the learner hoped to be able to perform. The responses of PER I learners to basically

the same question were quite similar in both content and frequency.

3. How are learners matched with tutors?

Over four-fifths of the PER II adult learners (81.4%) were matched with tutors within four weeks of their initial contact with the literacy program; over half of these began meeting with their tutors within two weeks of their initial program contact. Two-thirds of the adult learners reported having been interviewed prior to meeting their tutor, usually by someone other than their tutor. Fifty-five percent of the learners said that someone checked their reading skills before they began tutoring, but less than half (43%) were able to give the results of these assessments. Still, a third of the learners reported knowing their reading grade level upon entry. The mean of these levels reported levels was between third and fourth grade.

4. What are the logistics of the learning situation?

The vast majority of PER II learners (91.5%) received their tutoring instruction on a one-to-one basis, and most (65.0%) met with their tutors two times a week. Most learners (62.5%) met with their tutors in the library, while a fifth met in either the tutor's or learner's home. Slightly more than half (54.8%) have had their reading skills checked since tutoring began, usually by their tutors, and most (73.4%) know the results. Most learners said they studied on their own. The mean number of reported self-study hours was six.

5. To what extent do learners participate in the planning for tutoring?

Most learners (73.1%) reported having had a say as to where and when they met with their tutor. Of those who reported having no say, 28.6% said they did not meet where and/or when they wanted. Of all 104 learners, fifteen percent reported that they wanted to meet elsewhere, most desiring a more quiet and/or private place for tutoring than that afforded by the library. About half of the learners (48.1%) had set goals with their tutors at the onset of tutoring. Just over 40% of the learners expressed a present or past desire to meet more frequently with their tutors.

6. To what extent are learners satisfied with their tutoring?

Ninety-three percent of the PER II learners rated their tutors as being either "very good" or "excellent" (as compared to 84% of the PER I learners). Sixty-nine percent rated the books and materials used by their tutors as being either "very good" or "excellent" (as compared to 67% of the PER I learners).

The 104 PER II learners made 197 comments as to what they liked best about working with their tutors. Half the learners said that the skills taught were what they liked best, while almost as many (47.1%) cited the tutor's attitude and/or teaching style. Only 40 of the PER II learners commented as to what they liked least about working with their tutors, but just over half of these (52.5%) wanted to meet more often or in a different place or at a different time.

7. To what extent are learners active participants in the literacy program outside of tutoring?

Just over a fifth of the PER II adult learners reported having tried to recruit new learners into the program. The number of new learners actually coming into the program as a result averaged about one new learner per learner who reported recruitment activities. Sixty percent of the adult learners said they have "spread the word" about the program in other ways. Most report having done so simply by talking to others. Of those reporting more intensive types of literacy program participation, one had put up posters, one had been interviewed for a newspaper article, one had contacted a public official, one had served on a literacy program committee, and one had served on a community literacy coalition. These results are much the same as those reported in the PER I report.

It is to be noted, however, that California State Library personnel report additional evidence of learner participation in public communications not secured by the PER II interviews. Learners have contributed poems, essays and short stories to program newsletters which reach many hundreds of health and human services professionals, civic, church and community leaders. This brings learner progress into view before many audiences on many occasions. In several instances, the writings have been published by the library and disseminated across the community. Learners have also agreed to participate in ABC network and affiliate programming on

television and radio. In addition, there have been at least fifteen news story profiles of adult learner success in metropolitan, suburban and county newspapers.

8. To what extent are learners supported in their literacy program activities by family and friends?

Ninety percent of the adult learners have told family members or friends about their participation in the literacy program. Given an opportunity to name up to four persons each, learners named a total of 168 persons, almost all being either husbands, wives, children, parents, siblings, and/or friends. Twenty-three percent of these people, of whom children accounted for over one-third, were said to provide no support to the learner in his literacy program endeavors. However, of the other persons listed, most were said to provide moral support. Learners reported few persons providing support in the form of child care, transportation, or housesitting, but just over 30% of the persons listed have assisted the learner in reading, writing, and other learning activities. Fifteen percent of the learners have friends or relations involved in the literacy program with whom they spend time outside of the program, but in most cases knew these people prior to becoming involved in the program.

B. The Tutors' CLC Program Experience[6]

1. How do tutors first hear about the program?

As indicated in Table II-3, the vast majority of the PER II tutors first heard about the literacy program either through the broadcast of print media or at the public library. Compared to the PER I tutors, PER II tutors more often first heard about the program from the broadcast media, perhaps reflecting its increased use in CLC public communications strategies.[7]

---

[6]In comparing PER I and PER II tutor results, it is important to remember that the PER I tutor sample was selected randomly, whereas the PER II tutors were selected to match up with a random selection of learners so as to effect actual learner/tutor pairings.

[7]See section entitled "Public Communications" in "Appendix 4: California Literacy Campaign Update"

Table III-3: How Tutors First Hear About the Literacy Program

	PER I	PER II
Television	12.0%	17.0%
Radio	3.5%	6.7%
Newspaper	40.0%	21.5%
Library	21.0%	23.7%
Word of mouth	8.0%	11.9%
Other sources	15.5%	19.2%
(Number of responses)	(111)	(135)

2. Why do tutors decide to get involved in the program?

The PER II tutors gave 136 reasons for becoming tutors. The nature and frequency of the reasons given were similar to those found in other studies of volunteer literacy tutors, except for those who said they got involved because of their concern about local illiteracy, perhaps reflecting an increase in public awareness of the issue of adult illiteracy over the past two years.

Table III-4: Reasons People Become Tutors in CLC Literacy Program

	Percentage of Tutors Listing as a Reason
Desire to help others	36.4%
Desire to teach	35.4%
Concern about illiteracy in our community	24.2%
Enjoyment of reading	14.1%
Wanted something to do (i.e., retired)	13.1%
Enjoyment/self-satisfaction	8.1%
Desire for volunteer experience	4.0%
Part of group project (church group/friends)	2.0%

Tutor expectations for the tutoring experience were similar to their reasons for becoming tutors, with 51.5% expecting to be teaching people to read, 15.5% feeling that they would enjoy the teaching, and 11.3% saying that they would be helping others. Interestingly enough, no one said they expected to solve the problem of local illiteracy by becoming a tutor, which perhaps indicates some realism on the part of tutors with respect to the overall impact of their teaching in relation to resolving the issue of adult illiteracy in California.

3. What training do tutors receive?

PER II tutors received an average of 9.5 hours of initial tutor training. Compared with the PER I tutor sample, the PER II sample showed less variance in the number of hours of initial training and gave the training better ratings.

Table III-5: Hours and Tutor Ratings of Initial Tutor Training

		PER I	PER II
Hours	- Less than five	18%	24.2%
	Six to fifteen	62%	70.7%
	More than fifteen	20%	5.1%
Ratings	- Excellent or very good	63%	83.3%

Asked what they liked best about their initial training, PER II tutors predominantly cited learning either how to teach (45%), sensitivity to the adult learner (30%), and/or how to use the Laubach Way to Reading series (19%); the responses of PER I tutors were almost exactly the same. Thirty percent of the PER II tutors (as opposed to 58% of the PER I tutors) indicated additional information, materials, and/or activities which would have helped to better prepare them as tutors. The most frequently cited needs were for: more information about and from learners; more information on teaching adults with learning and other types of disabilities; more materials for learners who are "beyond the core curriculum"; and more information on other teaching techniques and materials.

Forty-eight percent of the PER II tutors had their teaching skills assessed prior to tutoring, as compared to only 20% of the PER I tutors. Of PER II tutors who

had not received a pre-tutoring assessment of their teaching skills, 30% thought such assessment to be a good idea, principally as a morale booster. The other 70% thought pre-tutoring assessment to be unnecessary, a third because they are experienced teachers and a quarter because they feel the uniqueness of each adult learner mitigates against the setting of teaching standards for tutors.

Fifty-five percent of the PER II tutors have received in-service training and attended an average of 3.5 in-service sessions each. (In contrast, only 39% of the PER I tutors had received any in-service training, nearly half of whom had attended only one such training session.) The most frequently reported types of in-service sessions attended by PER II tutors were advanced training in teaching techniques (28%), tutor support discussions or "rap groups" (20%), and presentations on the learning process and learning problems (15%). Eighty-four percent rated the sessions as either helpful or very helpful.

4. When are tutors matched with adult learners and what do tutors know about the learners?

Eighty-five percent of the PER II tutors were matched with adult learners within four weeks of their initial training session, comparable to reports from PER I tutors. In reporting on their tutoring experiences with individual adult learners selected for the PER II samples, most tutors had known something about these learners prior to the start of tutoring. Seventy-eight percent said that their learners had been interviewed prior to tutoring; 62% said that their learners' skills had been checked prior to tutoring. Forty-seven percent of the tutors knew the reading grade level of these learners prior to tutoring. The reported reading grade levels of these 47 learners ranged from less than first grade to ninth grade, with a mean of 2.1 and 73% at or below the second grade level. Forty percent of these learners had previously received tutoring in the program, a third of whom had not done well with their previous tutors, according to information provided to their current tutors.

5. What are the logistics of the tutoring situation?

Of the 99 PER II tutors, all had tutored adult learners individually; 13% had tutored learners in small groups (two to six learners) and 3% had taught learners in classroom settings (more than six learners).

Of the 82 tutors teaching a learner at the time they completed the PER II questionnaire ("active tutors"), all were working with learners on a one-to-one basis; 13% were also working with learners in small groups and 1% were also working with learners in classroom settings. Seventy-eight percent of these tutors were working with only one adult learner at the time of PER II; 12% were working with two learners, and 10% were tutoring three or more learners. These latter figures were virtually the same as those for the PER I active tutors. Information on tutoring logistics reported by 96 PER I and 99 PER II tutors in relation to specific adult learners is reported in Table III-6.

Table III-6: Information on Tutoring Logistics

	PER I	PER II
Meeting Place:		
Library	51%	63%
Tutor's/learner's home	28%	24%
Other places	21%	13%
Meeting Frequency:		
Once a week	43%	35%
Twice a week	47%	60%
More than twice a week	10%	5%

Twenty-four percent of the PER II tutors wanted to meet with their adult learners more frequently, and eight percent wanted to meet elsewhere, albeit mostly for reasons of personal convenience.

6. What teaching methods and materials do tutors use?

As in PER I, PER II tutors reported using a number and variety of teaching methods. Methods reported as being used on a regular basis by more than 10% of the PER II tutors are listed in Table III-7.

Table III-7: Teaching Methods Used on a Regular Basis by Literacy Program Tutors

	Percentage of Tutors Reporting Regular Use
Instruction in phonics	86%
Work with learner to identify needs/ set goals	71%
Instruction in word patterns	63%
Instruction in study skills	53%
Instruction in dictionary skills	52%
Language experience approach	39%
Tutor-developed strategies	38%
Neurological impress method	33%
Frierian techniques	24%
Problem-solving techniques	24%
Mathematics instruction	16%

Also as in PER I, PER II tutors reported using a number and variety of teaching materials. Teaching materials reported as being used on a regular basis by more than 10% of the tutors are listed in Table III-8.

Table III-8: Teaching Materials Used on a Regular Basis by Literacy Program Tutors

	Percentage of Tutors Reporting Regular Use
Laubach Way to Reading and LLA materials	77%
Student interest-related materials	65%
Newspapers and magazines	55%
Other non-text reading materials	35%
LVA books and materials	21%
Other reading curricular materials	21%
Reference books (dictionary, etc.)	15%
Spelling/writing/grammar workbooks	11%
Materials for non-English speakers	10%

Eighty-eight percent of the PER II tutors reported assigning homework for their learners, most of it designed as a review and reinforcement of what was covered in the previous lesson. In relation to the 99 learners about whom the PER II tutors reported, tutors said that 80% study on their own an average of 3.6 hours per week. As for the materials used with these learners, 86% of the tutors rated them as either "very good" or "excellent". However, a number listed additional instructional materials or activities they felt might have been more helpful with these learners. The most frequently cited by far (37%) was mature, high-interest, easy-to-read reading materials.

7. To what extent do tutors report that learners participate in the planning for tutoring?

In relation to the 99 adult learners about whom they reported, PER II tutors said that 81% of the learners had a say as to where and when the pairs met and that all but 4% met where and when they wanted. Seventy-three of the tutors said that they had set goals with these learners at the onset of tutoring.

8. To what extent do tutors know about the support learners have for their literacy program activities?

Eighty-four percent of the tutors listed one or more "significant others" in the lives of the learners about whom they reported. Of these, 95% were said to be supportive of the learner's literacy program activities.

9. To what extent are tutors satisfied with the tutoring experience?

Ninety-two percent of the PER II tutors said that their original expectations for the tutoring experience had been met at least in part; over half felt that their expectations had been met either completely or to a great extent. One-third of the tutors said that at least some of their expectations had not been met, with 72% of the reasons given relating to lack of skills improvement in the learner. Interestingly enough, an eighth of the responses about skills improvement were reported by tutors as "pleasant surprises," as some tutors had found learners to be more motivated or progressing more than they had originally expected.

Twenty-five of the tutors said that their expectations had changed since they began tutoring, with 60% of those responding saying they now expect learners to make slower improvements in basic skills. Twenty-eight percent say they now know tutoring to be more difficult and to require a greater variety of teaching techniques than they had originally expected.

Table III-9 summarizes the responses of PER II tutors to the question of the most important and significant way in which the tutoring experience has affected their lives:

Table III-9: Most Important Way in Which Tutoring Has Affected Tutor's Life (n=96)

Satisfaction from knowing I have helped others	40.6%
Feeling a sense of belonging/being useful	19.8%
Expanded interest in literacy/illiteracy	18.8%
Greater appreciation of my background and life	8.3%
Satisfaction of teaching and seeing people learn	7.3%
My friendship with the adult learner	5.2%

When asked about the greatest satisfaction they have derived from the tutoring experience, tutors gave three basic responses, with 60% saying it was from seeing people learn. Twenty-nine percent said it was from helping others, and 11% said it was from their friendship with the learner.

As to the biggest frustration or greatest disappointment of their tutoring experience, tutor responses, as summarized in Table III-10, were more varied, with 85% being related either to the learning difficulties or actions of the learners with whom they had worked.

Table III-10: Biggest Frustration or Greatest Disappointment of the Tutoring Experience (n=87)

Slow progress of learner	29.8%
Learner attendance problems	18.4%
Learner dropping out or leaving program	17.2%
Learner not doing homework assignments	14.9%
Learner's learning problems or difficulties	4.6%
Teaching English as a second language	4.6%
Scope of problem of illiteracy	3.4%
Lack of materials and resources at library	3.4%
Other	3.4%

For most tutors, the satisfactions of tutoring apparently outweighed the frustrations and disappointments, for 64% of the tutors said they plan to continue working as tutors either indefinitely or for a number of years. Less than 5% were not planning to tutor in the future, but 27% were unsure as to how much longer they would tutor.

10. To what extent are tutors active participants in the literacy program outside of tutoring?

Twenty percent of the tutors reported literacy program activities in addition to those involved in tutoring, virtually the same percentage as reported for PER I tutors. Of the 20 PER II tutors so involved, 70% had

done publicity work, 55% had done clerical work, 30% serve (or had served) on the program's advisory committee, 20% serve (or had served) as members of a community literacy coalition, and 20% were tutor trainers. Two of these twenty had done the same or similar work with literacy programs elsewhere.

C. Summary and Discussion of the Literacy Program Experience

From the perspective of the PER II adult learners and their tutors, the CLC program operations appear to be carried out in accordance with the general operational guidelines established by the California State Library (CSL). The majority of the programs have, by and large, adopted standards and procedures developed by Laubach Literacy Action (LLA) and/or Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA). Recruitment activities appear to be generating sufficient numbers of adult learners and tutors. Prior to tutoring, the majority of learners are interviewed and have their skills checked, and most are matched with tutors within weeks of initial contact with the programs. Tutors are quite satisfied with their training and are matched with adult learners shortly after training has been completed. Although the evaluators are not personally knowledgeable of the content of the various CLC tutor training programs, what tutors liked best about the training and used most regularly in their tutoring reflect both the intent and content of LLA and LVA training packages. This includes the use of a variety of teaching methods and materials so as to better meet the learning needs of individual adult learners.

Most tutors and learners work together one-to-one, but about 10% of each also work in small group and classroom settings. Although 90% of tutors are volunteers, the small percentage of paid tutors has apparently been a primary factor in development of program capacity to offer teaching in small group and classroom settings. Most learners have a say as to where and when they meet with their tutors. Most tutors and learners are satisfied with where they meet, which for the majority is in a public library. The majority of learners and tutors are satisfied with the frequency of their meetings, which for the majority is two times a week. The majority of tutors report using goal-setting methods with their adult learners, and about half the learners report having set goals at the onset of tutoring. A majority of adult learners and most tutors are quite satisfied with the teaching materials used. Most tutors and learners report learners to be doing homework (although learners report about twice as much time spent doing homework as tutors do, perhaps due to different interpretations of what constitutes "homework"). Most learners get moral support for their learning activities from family members and friends, some of

whom also help with these learning activities, and most tutors are aware of this support at least to some degree. Most learners rate their tutors highly, and most tutors have derived a great deal of satisfaction from their teaching activities.

As is apparent, most learners are satisfied with their program experience and are, at least to some degree, active participants in establishing the content and process of their experience. Still, there is room for improvement with respect to the nature and extent of learner involvement in determining and assessing the program experience, both from a personal and an organizational point-of-view.

At the personal level, approximately 40% of learners did not have their skills checked upon entering the program and, among those who did, the majority either do not know or cannot recall the results. At least half of learners report not being involved in setting goals at the onset of tutoring, although nearly three-quarters of the tutors report using this method regularly in working with learners. At least half of learners have not had their skills checked since they began tutoring and, of those who have, and about a quarter do not know or cannot recall the results. At least a fifth of learners have no say as to where and when they meet for their tutoring sessions. Fifteen percent say they want to meet elsewhere, with most of these wanting more quiet and privacy than that afforded by library meeting sites. Forty percent of learners (as well as 24% of tutors) want to have tutoring sessions more often.

On an organizational level, 90% of the adult learners report telling family members about the literacy program, and 60% say they "spread the word" to others. About a fifth of adult learners successfully recruit new learners into the literacy program. Yet, less than 2% of adult learners are members of literacy program boards or coalitions and, outside of possible contributions to literacy newsletters, only about 5% of adult learners are actively involved in formal public communications activities engaged in by their literacy programs.

In summary, CLC programs have just cause for pride in their operational capabilities. Most learners and tutors are quite satisfied with their program experiences. However, for a significant minority of learners, this satisfaction is accompanied by some expressed dissatisfaction with where and how often they meet with their tutors. This dissatisfaction may be an inevitable result of scarce resources. There are only so many tutoring sites available, just as tutors have a limited number of hours available.

Another possible cause of the dissatisfaction may be a lack of learner participation both in the planning of individual tutoring experiences and in the planning of the total literacy program structure. Perhaps if learners were more active participants in on-going program development activities, learner preferences such as those noted above and those noted in PER I would be recognized on the local level and creative planning used to address them. The implications of this conclusion and recommendations for addressing the issues involved are presented in the final two chapters of the report.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

"Program effectiveness" refers to the extent to which the program experience of adult learners in CLC local library literacy programs has resulted in improvement of learners' functional literacy skills and enhancement of their lives outside of the program. The purpose of this chapter is to delineate and analyze CLC service outcomes from the perspectives of the adult learners and tutors who participated in Program Effectiveness Review II (PER II).

The first section of this chapter presents program effectiveness information based on the responses of all 104 adult learners and 99 tutors who participated in PER II. For those questions asked of both the learners and their tutors, a comparison of the information given by both halves of the 86 matched learner/tutor pairs is provided. However, for each of the program effectiveness measures discussed, there were a large number of cases in which either the learner and/or tutor did not provide a response, thereby negating the possibility of comparison. Nonetheless, results indicate that, as a result of literacy program participation, most learners evidence skills improvement, while some experience accompanying life enhancement as well.

The second section of the chapter focuses more specifically upon the service outcome of skills improvement, using as measures learner and tutor assessments of the functional literacy skills possessed by adult learners prior to entering the literacy program and after they have received tutoring. Results are presented for the 75 matched learner/tutor pairs who have met ten or more times for tutoring. Learner "progress," or the extent to which the learner has demonstrated improved functional literacy skills, is examined in relation to certain learner characteristics and some key program experience variables, as well as to life enhancement outcomes. The results further validate the conclusion that most CLC adult learners demonstrate improvements in functional literacy skills, provide information as to differences in learner and tutor perceptions of skills improvement, and suggest the role that active learner participation plays in the learning process.

As noted earlier in this report, many of the same questions were asked of both learners and tutors. This procedure was followed for two major reasons. The first was to more accurately determine what was actually going on in the tutoring relationships. The assumption was that if both learner and tutor reported a piece of information, that information was most likely accurate. The second reason was to determine the degree to which learners and tutors shared

common perceptions of the relationship, learner needs, learner expectations and learner outcomes.

This methodology yielded matched learner and tutor responses that generally showed little agreement. This lack of agreement may be the result of tutors' limited knowledge of learners. However, it may be simply a function of the methodology. Yet another explanation is the different perspectives learners and tutors bring to the relationship. Learners see the value of the tutoring in terms of their total lives. Tutors, of course, do not have access to full information on learners' lives and can report with certainty only about what they observe in the tutoring session. This methodological problem and possible solutions are discussed in more depth in Chapter 5.

A. Description of Service Outcomes (based on responses from all PER II adult learners and tutors)

1. Has the literacy program helped learners as they thought it would?

When asked this question, 90.4% of the 104 PER II adult learners responded in the affirmative, giving 111 ways in which the program had helped them to meet the expectations they held upon entering the program. Of the seventy-eight tutors responding to this question about their learners, 83.9% of the learners were said to have had their expectations met by the program. Sixty-seven tutors specified the ways in which the program had helped their adult learners. Results are summarized in Table IV-1.

Table IV-1: How the Literacy Program Has Helped Adult Learners

	Learners Report	Tutors Report
General basic skills improvement (improved reading, writing, and/or spelling)	37%	42%
Specific basic skills acquisition (improved grammar, vocabulary, etc.)	17%	-
Improved self-confidence, self-esteem, etc.	17%	24%
Functional reading skills improvements (not related to work, i.e., Bible, books, magazines, etc.)	12%	18%
Functional reading skills improvements (work-related, i.e., manuals, texts, etc.)	11%	9%
(number of learners)	(94)	(67)

Of the 10 learners who said the program had not helped them as they expected, 8 gave reasons. Four said it was because they either left the program or left it too soon. Two said they needed more tutoring time with their tutors, and two gave answers which indicated some difficulties with their tutors.

Tutors said that 15 of their learners had not been helped by the program as learners expected, with reasons given for thirteen. Insufficient time in tutoring was given as the reason for three learners, and in another three cases either the tutor or the learner had left the program. In six cases, the learner was reported to be making progress, but had yet to achieve the skills necessary to realize his/her expectations. One learner was reported to be frustrated by spelling problems and lack of "involving" reading materials.

Comparisons of responses from the learners and tutors of 59 matched pairs indicated basic agreement as to whether the program had helped the learner. However, as to the specific way in which the program had helped the learner, only 29% of the pairs gave at least one response common to both the learner's and tutor's responses. For the most part, learners initially responded to this question in a "yes" or "no" fashion; tutors, in some cases, gave more "qualified" responses, as when reporting that the learner had progressed, but had yet to realize his/her original expectations for the program.

2. What kinds of goals do learners set for themselves and what progress are they making in reaching them?

   As reported previously, 48% of the PER II adult learners established goals with their tutors at the onset of tutoring. These learners reported on the 56 goals they had set. Of the 99 PER II tutors, 68% reported setting goals with their adult learners. Sixty-three of these tutors reported on the goals they set with their learners. Results are summarized in Table IV-2.

Table IV-2: Goals Set by Adult Learners at the Onset of Tutoring

	Learners Report	Tutors Report
Secure a high school diploma/get a GED	28%	3%
Read, write, and/or spell better	26%	32%
Achieve a higher reading grade level	14%	-
Get a new job/a better job	12%	21%
Read newspapers or particular books	10%	21%
Prepare for or go to college	6%	3%
Write notes, letters or stories	6%	3%
Get a driver's license	6%	10%
Become a United States citizen	2%	2%
Become more functional in everyday life	2%	
Speak English better		6%
(number of learners)	(50)	(63)

All fifty of the adult learners reported on progress they were making toward reaching their goals, with 14% having reached them (seven of the above categories were represented by the seven goals achieved). Of the 43 learners who said they had yet to reach their goals, most (93%) felt they were making at least some progress. However, of these, 25% either felt as if they were not making much progress or could not say what kind of progress they were making.

Only 51 of the tutors reported on the progress their adult learners were making toward goal achievement. Twenty-two percent were said to have reached their goal. Of the 40 learners reported to have not yet reached their goals, all were said to be making progress, with but 7.5% reported to be making little progress.

Learners and tutors in 28 of the matched pairs agreed that they had set goals for tutoring. Of these, 54% agreed as to the goal set, most of these being in relation to either general basic skills improvement or the ability to perform specific functional reading tasks. However, there were no learner/tutor agreements when learners said their goal was to reach a higher reading grade level, and almost no learner/tutor agreements when the learner gave a formal educational goal. When learners reported that they had yet to achieve their goals, tutors agreed; however, learners were more likely than tutors to feel that they had made little progress toward meeting their goals.

3. What can learners read and write as a result of having been in the literacy program?

Of the 94 learners responding to this question, 82 (87%) said there were things that they had learned to read or write as a result of being in the program. Of these 82, all but eight (90%) listed something they had learned to read; fourteen (17%) listed something they had learned to write. Of the 76 tutors responding to this question, 72 (95%) said there were things their learners had learned to read or write as a result of being in the program. Of these 72 learners, all but six (92%) were said to have learned to read something, and 29 (38%) were said to have learned to write something.

Table IV-3: What Learners Can Read or Write as a Result of Having Been in the Literacy Program

	Learners Report	Tutors Report
Read - Books (specific or general, not including children's books or skill books)	28%	18%
- Newspapers and magazines	24%	18%
- Alphabet/numbers/words	11%	28%
- Street/traffic signs	9%	11%
- Children's books	7%	1%
- Work-related materials	6%	5%
- Mail/letters/bills/flyers	6%	5%
- Packages/instructions/forms	6%	9%
- Laubach skills books/stories	2%	11%
- Other reading materials	2%	12%
Write- Various writing tasks	15%	38%
Other- Spelling, grammar, etc.	13%	4%
Nothing or do not know	13%	5%
(number of learners)	(94)	(76)

Of 69 matched pairs of learners and tutors with both parties responding to this question, there was learner/tutor agreement in 80% of the pairs as to the fact that the learner had learned to read and write things that s/he could not read or write before tutoring began. However, due in large part to the open-ended nature of the question and the number of varying responses it drew, there was learner/tutor agreement as to the specific things learned in only 17% of the pairs. The likelihood of such agreement was further decreased by the fact that learners listed more things that they had learned to read (75% of the list of 129 things that 82 learners said they had learned), whereas tutors listed

more things that the learners had learned to write (38% of the 158 things that they said 72 learners had learned.)

4. What is the most significant way in which the literacy program has affected the lives of adult learners?

When asked this question, 86% of the PER II adult learners gave 99 ways in which the program has had a positive and significant impact on their lives. The other 14% gave singular responses, of which two-thirds said they either could not say or did not know and one-third gave responses indicating that the program had not had a significant impact on their lives. Tutors, reporting on 87 learners, most frequently saw the program as having had its greatest impact on the self-confidence and self-esteem of learners. Responses are summarized in Table IV-4.

Table IV-4: Ways in Which the Program Has Had Significant Impact on the Lives of Adult Learners

	Learners Report	Tutors Report
Improved self-confidence and self-esteem	32%	68%
Improved reading, writing, and spelling	26%	8%
Improved competence in everyday life	13%	6%
Improved social life	10%	5%
Improved family life	6%	3%
Improved self-direction	4%	5%
Other (basically positive)	9%	1%
Do not know/cannot tell yet	9%	3%
Program has not helped/no significant impact	6%	1%
(number of learners)	(104)	(87)

Because of the variety of ways in which learners and tutors described impact on learners' lives, no comparison was made of matched learner/tutor responses.

5. What changes have occurred in the lives of adult learners as a result of being in the literacy program?

All 104 PER II adult learners responded to questions as to whether participation in the literacy program had resulted in changes in either their educational goals, job situation or career plans, family life, or use of leisure time. Eighty percent of the learners reported at least one change that had occurred as a result of their participation in the literacy program. Sixty-five percent reported more than one change.

Tutors were asked the same questions about their adult learners, to which 95 responded. A relatively high percentage of tutors did not know (DK) the answers to these questions about their learners, possibly because while the tutoring relationship is highly personal and supportive, it is not meant to be a counseling relationship. Thus, learners and tutors probably discuss learners' "outside" lives to a limited extent. Initial learner and tutor responses to these questions are reported in Table IV-5.

Table IV-5: Changes in the Lives of Adult Learners Resulting from Literacy Program Participation

	Learners Report		Tutors Report		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	DK
Changes in educational goals/plans	28%	72%	20%	46%	34%
Changes in job situation/plans	25%	75%	30%	16%	54%
Changes in family life?	32%	68%	25%	38%	37%
Changes in use of free time	62%	38%	37%	14%	49%
(number of learners)	(n=104)		(n=95)		

In relation to changes in adult learner educational plans or goals, learners more often indicated aspirations of going to college, whereas tutors more often reported learner decisions to complete high school or secure a graduate equivalence degree. Of the ten pairs in which learners and tutors agreed that the learner had made changes in his/her educational plans, four showed learner/tutor agreement as to the nature of the change. Results are summarized in Table IV-6.

Table IV-6: Changes in Adult Learner Educational Plans or Goals

	Learner Report	Tutor Report
Decided to go to college/ further resolve to do so	35%	11%
Decided to get HS diploma or GED or "go back to school"	17%	37%
Decided to study for career change/ trade license or certification	24%	26%
Other changes in goals or plans	24%	27%
(number of learners)	(29)	(19)

In relation to learner changes in job situations or plans, learners more often reported having decided to change job fields, while tutors more often reported their learners to have either secured a job or secure a new job. Of the eleven learner/tutor pairs agreeing that a job-related change had occurred, five showed learner/tutor agreement as to the nature of the change. Results are summarized in Table IV-7.

Table IV-7: Changes in Adult Learner Job Situations or Plans

	Learners Report	Tutors Report
Present job situation improved (includes seeking of better position with same employer)	35%	26%
Decided to change occupational field	31%	19%
Got a job/got a new job	23%	37%
Other job-related changes	12%	19%
(number of learners)	(26)	(27)

Of the 33 adult learners reporting changes in their family life, a third cited the pride of family members in the learner's literacy endeavors. Another 27% reported improved relations with children or grandchildren as a result of either being able to speak to them in English or being able to help them with their homework. To a related but separate item, 42% of the learners said they now spend more time reading with family members than they did before tutoring, with children being two-thirds of the family members mentioned.

Tutor reports on changes in the family lives of 23 adult learners were more numerous, varied and specific. Of the 28 changes described by tutors, 17.8% indicated improved learner/children relations and 14.3% related to the increased pride of family members. Other changes cited by tutors for more than one learner each included: Increased personal independence; improved relations with spouse; increased problems with family members; and enrollment of family members in the literacy program. Four of the learner/tutor pairs agreed as to changes in the learner's family life.

Of the 65 adult learners reporting changes in use of their free time, 78% said they now spend more time reading than they did before tutoring. Tutors, reporting on 35 adult learners, said that 57% of the learners now spend more of their free time reading. Of the 22 learner/tutor pairs agreeing that changes in this regard had occurred in the learner's life, half agreed as to the specific nature of the change.

6. Do adult learners make more use of the library since beginning with the literacy program?

Only 22% of the PER II adult learners had library cards when they began tutoring; 56% now have library cards. Of those who had cards prior to tutoring, 70% report using the library more since tutoring began. Adult learners with library cards report using the library an average of three times a month.

B. Analysis of Service Outcomes (based on responses from 75 matched pairs of PER II adult learners and tutors who have met for at least ten tutoring sessions.)

1. How were the functional literacy skills of adult learners measured?

The functional literacy skills of the adult learners were assessed by asking learners and their tutors to twice assess learner ability to perform seven everyday reading tasks. The first assessment (made retrospectively) was of learner skills at the time the learner began in the literacy program (hereafter referred to as the "pre-rating"). The second assessment was of learner skills at the time of administration of the PER II interview and questionnaire instruments (hereafter referred to as the "post-rating"). Learners were asked the pre-rating questions (page 4 of Appendix 5) early in their interviews and the post-rating questions (page 10 of Appendix 5) 15 to 20 minutes later, thereby making it possible for them to compare ratings only by memory. Tutors were asked the pre-rating and post-rating questions at similar intervals within their questionnaires (pages 9 and 12 of Appendix 6), but of course could go back and compare responses.

The following learner abilities were assessed:

- Reading the newspaper;
- Reading bills;
- Reading cooking directions on food products;
- Reading the menus at McDonald's;
- Reading notices from work; and
- Reading notes from children's school.

One of four assessment ratings was assigned to each reading task:

- "0" = can't remember (do not know)/not applicable;
- "1" = could not (cannot) read the material at all or not enough to understand it;
- "2" = could (can) read the material somewhat, a little bit, not completely, but enough to use the information; or
- "3" = could (can) read the materials with little or no problem.

For both learners and tuturs, there was a high, positive correlation between ratings on one skill and ratings on the other skills. This is to say that, high learner or tutor ratings on one skill were usually accompanied by high ratings on the other skills. This was determined by correlating ratings with each other. (For example, learner ratings of reading the newspaper were correlated with learner ratings for reading bills, reading cooking directions, etc.) The same procedure was used with tutor ratings for learners on each skill.

Because skills ratings were highly and positively correlated with each other, it was possible to estimate ratings when either a learner or a tutor responded with a "0" to any particular skills item. Missing ratings were thus estimated by averaging the existing ratings. Then, for each set of ratings (learner pre-ratings, learner post-ratings, tutor pre-ratings, and tutor post-ratings), the 7 ratings were summed to produce a composite functional skills score, which could range from a low of 7 (a rating of "1" for each skill) to a high of 21 (a rating of "3" for each skill). There were thus calculated four composite skills scores for each learner: one learner pre-rating; one learner post-rating, one tutor pre-rating, and one tutor post-rating.

Learner composite pre-rating scores were subtracted from learner composite post-rating scores to determine the change in scores between before tutoring began and after ten or more hours of tutoring. The same calculations were made for tutor composite scores. The difference between the pre- and post-rating composite scores thereby produced a "progress" score, which at times throughout this report will be simply referred to as "progress."

2. Do results indicate that learners demonstrate improvement in functional literacy skills?

Analysis of progress scores derived from learner and tutor ratings of learner abilities to perform the seven reading tasks showed that the functional literacy skills of learners did improve. The difference between the mean of learner composite pre-ratings (14.1) and the mean of learner composit post-ratings (17.5) was statistically significant ($p < .0001$). The same was true for the difference between the means of tutor composite pre-ratings (12.8) and post-ratings (17.4), at the same level of significance. These results indicate that it is highly unlikely that these reported changes occurred by chance.

3. What relationship exists between learner and tutor assessments of functional literacy skills?

No significant relationships were found among learner pre-ratings and tutor pre-ratings; nor were any significant relationships found among learner post-ratings and tutor post-ratings. This indicates a wide discrepancy between learner and tutor assessments of the learners' ability to perform the seven reading tasks. Generally speaking, learners tended to rate their skills prior to tutoring higher than did tutors, whereas tutors tended to rate learner skills higher after tutoring than did learners. Moreover, learners tended to rate themselves as having made less progress than did tutors. This difference may be due to learners rating themselves in terms of the complex world in which they lead their day-to-day lives, while tutors rated learners in terms of the "world" of the tutoring session.

4. What relationship exists between the functional literacy skills a learner possesses prior to tutoring and the progress made as a result of tutoring?

A significant ($p < .0001$) negative correlation was found between learner composite pre-rating scores and learner progress scores ($r = -.63$); the same relationship was found to exist between tutor pre-rating and progress scores ($r = -.64$). This means that the higher the learner's composite pre-rating score, the lower the learner's progress score, whether rated by learners or their tutors. This might mean that the more skilled the learner upon entry into the literacy program, the less progress s/he will show in tutoring. However, it is more likely that this result reflects the basic nature of the functional literacy skills assessed and the fact that a number of learners enter the literacy programs already possessing these skills. Examination of the individual composite pre-rating scores in part validates this assumption, as about one-third of the learners were rated by themselves or their tutors as having little or no problem in performing six to seven of the assessed reading tasks at the time tutoring began.

5. What relationship exists between functional literacy skills improvement and some general characteristics of the learner?

Each of the following learner-related variables were correlated with learner- and tutor-reported progress scores for the learners:

- Level of educational achievement;
- Employment status (employed/unemployed);
- Sex; and
- Hours of tutoring received.

Learner-reported progress approached a significant ($p < .15$) negative correlation ($r = -.18$) with level of formal education achieved. This is to say that the higher the learner's level of formal education, the less the self-assessed progress of the learner as measured by the difference between pre- and post-rating composite scores. However, a significant ($p < .10$) positive correlation ($r = .22$) was found between educational level and learner composite pre-rating scores. This indicates, therefore, that the previously reported negative correlation between learner pre-ratings and progress is in part related to the educational level of the learners involved. In other words, those learners most likely to have rated themselves as having mastered the seven reading skills prior to tutoring are those with more years of formal education.

Learner and tutor progress scores both approached a significant ($p < .13$) negative correlation ($r = -.19$) with employment status, such that learners who were employed were likely to show more progress than learners who were not employed. While additional study is needed to truly understand this finding, a possible explanation is that learners who are employed, when compared to learners who are not, may be less concerned with the basic survival issues of food, shelter, etc., and thus be better able to focus their time and attention on learning functional literacy skills. Perhaps by being employed some are more likely to see the potential benefit in improving their functional literacy skills and thus are more motivated to do so. Or it may be, as have been found in some studies of working high school and college students, that the combined status of "worker" and "student" provides some learners with a combination of self-esteem, motivation, and structure that allows them to make more effective use of the time they set aside for learning and studying.

Tutor-reported learner progress scores correlated negatively ($r = -.23$) and significantly ($p < .10$) with learners' gender, such that tutors rated progress of females less than that of males. Several explanations of this result were posited. First, the correlation between

tutor pre-ratings and gender was calculated and found insignificant. This finding eliminated the possibility that female learners were less skilled at the start of tutoring than males.

Second, the finding that female learners had fewer years of formal schooling than males was explored as an explanation. This was rejected in light of an earlier finding that learners with fewer years of education actually made more functional literacy skills progress than those with more years.

Finally, employment status was considered as a factor. The correlation between gender and employment was positive ($r = .21$) and significant ($p < .10$) meaning that female learners were less likely to be employed outside the home than male learners. As noted earlier, employed learners tended to make more progress.

The data gathered for this evaluation is not sufficient to explain the progress/gender correlation. It may be that employment outside the home is related to progress. It may be, however, that there are gender biases operating within the tutoring relationship. Or, it may be that the predominantly female tutors expected greater competence from their male learners and therefore promote and/or perceive such. These explanations are purely speculative and cannot be verified by the data gathered. However, this finding is certainly deserving of further investigation.

Tutor-assessed progress of learners correlated significantly ($p < .10$) and positively ($r = .18$) with hours of tutoring received. In other words, according to tutors, the more hours learners spend studying with tutors, the more skills improvement they demonstrate. This result was certainly expected. However, learner-reported progress and hours of instruction had a very small (.05) correlation. In an effort to understand this result, hours of instruction were divided into five intervals (10-20 hours, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, and 51 or more). The average learner-reported progress score associated with each interval was calculated. Examination of this data indicated that learners with the higher numbers of tutoring hours had average progress scores that were about the same or lower than those of learners with fewer tutoring hours.

This relationship between learner-reported progress and hours of instruction may be explained in at least two ways. First, it may be that, over time, recall of pre-tutoring skill levels diminished and thus learners report

pre- and post-skills to be about the same. It may also be that some of the learners with the most hours of instruction are those who are having the most difficulty learning. This explanation is supported by the relatively low pre-tutoring learner-reported mean ratings for learners with 41 or more hours of instruction. It may be that the 41-plus hour learners are those who began tutoring with little or no reading ability. They may be the people who have learning problems and who will need a great deal of instruction before skills improvement is evident.

6. What is the relationship between functional skills improvement and measures of learner empowerment?

The term empowerment is used here to indicate the degree to which adult learners are active participants in the tutoring process and literacy program operations.

The following learner-reported variables were used as measures of empowerment:

- Tutor use of input solicited from the learner as to where tutoring would occur;
- Satisfaction with meeting place;
- Perception of goal setting and achievement; and
- Learner recruitment of other learners for the literacy program.

Each of these variables was correlated with learner- and tutor-reported progress.

There was a significant correlation between learner-reported progress and whether learner input as to where tutoring would take place was used ($r = .29$, $p < .20$). Those learners who believed that their input had been used reported more progress. These results suggest that there is a relationship between playing a part in organizing of the tutoring situation and perceiving progress.

The correlation between learner-reported progress and learner satisfaction with their present tutoring site was significant ($r = .21$, $p < .10$). Learners who did not want to change tutoring sites tended to report more progress than those who wanted a change. This result indicated that there is a relationship between satisfaction with the tutoring location and learner progress.

Although learner involvement in determining the logistics of the tutoring relationship obviously bears some relationship to development of a good working rapport with the tutor, perhaps the more important aspect of empowerment is the extent to which the tutor involves the learner in determining the direction and content of the tutoring instruction itself. Accordingly, several aspects of tutor-reported utilization of goal-setting methods were correlated with learner- and tutor-assessed progress of the learner.

The correlation between tutor-assessed learner progress and tutor reports of having established goals with learners at the onset of tutoring was both positive ($r = .28$) and significant ($p < .10$). Similarly, tutor reported progress was positively and significantly related to having reported that learners had achieved their goals. This was to be expected. However, correlations between learner-assessed progress and reports of goal setting and achievement, although positive, was not significant. The lack of significance is likely due to two factors: learners frequently reported goals well outside of the reach of this program, thereby limiting the possibility of achievement; and learners also reported fewer goals overall, thus diminishing the potential pool for correlation.

Finally, learner-assessed progress was correlated with two measures of learner involvement in literacy program operations outside of the tutoring relationship. Learner progress was found to correlate in a positive ($r = .21$) and significant way ($p < .10$) with learners having successfully recruited new learners into the program. Similarly, learner-assessed progress was found to be positively ($r = .28$) and significantly ($p < .10$) correlated with their having participated in formal activities designed to promote the literacy program. Obviously, the more progress learners demonstrate to themselves, the more likely they are to become actively involved in promoting the program to others.

7. <u>What is the relationship between learner progress and learner reports of life changes?</u>

Each of these learner-reported variables were correlated with learner- and tutor-assessed progress to explore the relationship between skills improvement and life enhancement.

- Whether the program helped learners in the way they expected; and

- Whether changes had occurred in learner educational goals or plans, job situations or plans, family life, use of leisure time, and time spent reading with the family.

There was a positive ($r = .19$) and significant ($p < .10$) correlation between learner-assessed progress and learner reports that the program had helped them as expected. Tutor assessed progress correlated positively ($r = .18$) and significantly ($p < .10$) with learner reports of changes in educational plans, but learner-assessed progress did not. Neither learner-assessed nor tutor-assessed progress correlated significantly with learner-reported changes in job-related situations, use of leisure time, or time spent reading with family members. However, both learner-assessed and tutor-assessed progress correlated positively ($r = .25$ and $r = .19$, respectively) with learner-reported changes in family life ($p < .10$). Apparently, the single most common life enhancement outcome detected by the measures used in this evaluation and experienced by learners showing functional skills improvement is in learners' relationships with members of their families.

C. Program Effectiveness Summary

As a group and in relation to a number of different measures, adult learners and tutors involved in Program Effectiveness Review II left little doubt that most adult learners who participate in California Literacy Campaign (CLC) local library literacy programs evidence functional skills improvement. Perhaps as important, the majority of adult learners who participate in CLC programs experience some change in their lives as a result of the literacy program experience, most frequently in how they make use of their free time. There is compelling evidence that taking part in literacy program tutoring activities results not only in the increased ability of California adults to read, but in their reading more and reading more often, particularly with family members and most frequently with their children. This latter result may be linked to the fact that the one life enhancement outcome which correlated significantly correlated with skills improvement involved positive changes in learner relationships with members of the learner's family. Perhaps this is not at all surprising, for as indicated in Chapter III, family members are the people most often cited by adult learners as supporting them in their literacy program activities. Although a few learners reported problems with

spouses that were related to literacy program participation, in most cases the impact on the family appears to be a positive one, especially for learners who have increased their functional literacy skills.

The relationship between skills improvement and other types of life changes is much less clear. Many adult learners come into the program with previous experience in adult education programs, and many learners have formal educational goals which they desire to pursue. Obviously, many of the adult learners entering CLC programs perceive formal education to be an avenue to life enhancement and view participation in the literacy program as a step down that street. Some have even integrated their occupational career plans with their educational plans.

Perhaps this is a partial explanation for the finding that learner changes in educational goals correlated with functional literacy skills improvement only from the perspective of tutors; in short, some learners had already set these goals prior to tutoring, but some tutors were not aware of these goals or became aware of them only after the learner had shown skills improvement. However, even when learners and tutors agreed that learners had educational goals, tutors more often reported these goals to relate to completion of secondary school, whereas learners more often cited goals in relation to going to college. Similar discrepancies between learner and tutor perceptions of learner goals were found in other areas, with learners more often reporting major, long-range goals and tutors more often reporting task-specific, short-range goals. Likewise, there were discrepancies between learner and tutor assessments of learner skills, the nature and extent of learner progress while in the program, and the impact of the program upon the learner's life.

In rating learner functional literacy skills in relation to seven everyday reading tasks prior to tutoring, learners rated their skills higher than tutors did. Following tutoring, tutors rated learner skills in these tasks higher than learners did, thereby reporting more learner progress in this regard than did learners. In response to more open-ended questions relating to learner skills improvement, most tutors and learners reported specific reading gains, but tutors much more frequently cited writing gains as well. When citing the impact that participation in the program had had upon the learner, learners cited functional literacy skills improvement three times more often than tutors, while tutors cited improved self-confidence and self-esteem twice as often as learners. Although the majority of learners reported life changes as a result of participation in the

literacy program, many tutors were not aware that such changes had occurred.

One could argue that these results reflect unrealistic learner perceptions of what they can do, where they are going, and how they will get there. Although there may be some validity to this argument, it is nonetheless apparent that learners and their tutors come to the tutoring experience with different expectations and perspectives as to the nature, content, direction, and outcomes of that experience. The tutor's perspective of the learner is limited, in most cases by the social and physical boundaries of the tutoring relationship. Typically, an adult learner and a tutor from decidedly different walks of life meet regularly once or twice a week for limited periods of time, often in public places, to work toward improving the learner's reading and writing skills. However ambiguous or disparate learner and tutor perceptions of the learner's hopes, dreams and goals for the tutoring experience, the unwritten contract between the tutor and learner is for the teaching and learning of literacy skills.

While the boundaries of the tutoring relationship and the tenets of the unwritten tutoring contract may in most cases be appropriate, they may also subtly hinder communication between the learner and tutor with respect to the learner's literacy needs and related aspirations for the future. The learner and the tutor, in their commendable effort to stick to the task of "learning to read and write," may neglect important planning discussion and activities. Without such discussion and activity, the tutor can often only guess at how the work provided by the tutor relates to realization of the learner's expectations. It is possible that learner "fade-out" and "drop-out" may, in some cases, relate to this hypothesized lack of communication between the learner and tutor in relation to the process and intended outcomes of the tutoring situation. Learner involvement in decision-making about where and when to meet appears to be related to demonstration of learner progress. However, involvement in the learning process needs also to incorporate the tutor in assisting the learner in setting and agreeing to realistic, achievable and meaningful learning goals which relate to the learner's reasons for taking literacy instruction in the first place. More of this activity appeared to be taking place in CLC programs at the time of PER II than at the time of PER I, but obviously tutors need additional training in how to assist learners in learning how to establish, prioritize, and integrate long-term goals, short-term objectives, and strategies for achieving them.

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Even a cursory review of the findings presented in the preceding chapters provides considerable evidence that the California Literary Campaign (CLC) is a maturing and expanding program which meets the literacy skills development needs of a diverse group of California residents. The evaluators who conducted Program Effectiveness Review II enjoy the special perspective of having seen the program during its initial months of operation when its organizational structure and programmatic procedures were still emerging. Since that time, visible gains have been made in most areas of CLC program operations, most notably in relation to the quality of tutor training, the diversification of instructional methods and materials, the involvement of learners in the planning and assessment of learning activities, and the development of ongoing program evaluation mechanisms.

The mission statement articulated in Chapter I provides an appropriate and effective standard by which to evaluate the meaningfulness of the PER II results, and thus to review the overall effectiveness of the California Literacy Campaign. The first part of Chapter V contains this summary review, highlighting the strengths and needs of CLC program operations.

The second part of this chapter presents recommendations for program modifications. These recommendations address those aspects of program operation that are not fully congruent with the stated mission of CLC.

The third section of the chapter presents recommendations for future program evaluations. It includes suggested methodological changes, as well as areas in need of further and more refined study.

A. Summary of PER II results

1. Is the population being served by CLC the population described in the mission statement?

There is no doubt that the adult learners participating in CLC local library literacy programs are people in need of literacy education. However, as a group, these learners do not entirely fit the learner profile described in the mission statement.

The CLC mission statement describes the target learner population as:

> "...adults aged 16 and older who reside in the State of California, ordinarily speak English in their daily lives, and are not currently being

served by other educational programs. Particular emphasis is to be given to serving those adults who have less than an eighth grade education, who have a family income below the poverty level, and for whom functional illiteracy presents a major barrier to upward mobility, in terms of either employment and/or quality of life." (See Chapter I, Part B.)

The adult learners who participated in PER II, found to be fairly representative of the CLC learner population as-a-whole, were all over sixteen years of age and residents of the State of California. Most spoke English in their daily lives, although slightly over five percent did not. Most were not being served by other educational programs at the time of entry into the literacy program, although about 40% had had largely unsatisfactory past experiences in adult basic education classes and about 5% were enrolled in community college courses or trade schools.

Twenty-three percent of the PER II adult learners appeared to meet the profile of educationally disenfranchised, socio-economically disadvantaged persons for whom functional illiteracy probably constitutes a major barrier to upward mobility. These were persons with less than a ninth grade education for whom a combination of employment, income, and family status characteristics indicated they live below, at or about the poverty level. However, 37% of the PER II adult learners had a high school degree and 34% had family incomes of more than $20,000 per year.

Thus, the majority of CLC adult learners appear to be working class individuals with some high school education and some functional literacy skills. There is also a minority segment of the CLC adult learner population which is lower class, about a fifth of whom seem to fit the "harder-to-reach, harder-to-teach" emphasis contained in the CLC mission statement. However, there is also a minority segment of the CLC adult learner population which is decidedly middle class. Regardless of socio-economic background, most CLC learners perceive their local library literacy programs to be viable mediums for improving their literacy skills and, as a result, the quality of their lives.

2. <u>As a result of participation in CLC programs, are learners able to read and write English well enough to handle the functional literacy demands they face in their daily lives?</u>

PER II results do not offer a definitive answer to this question. Without a doubt, most CLC adult learners demonstrate and report functional literacy skills improvement to be a result of literacy program participation. However, determination of the extent to which learners retain and utilize these skills outside of tutoring would require a longitudinal evaluation design, as well as measures of functional literacy skills being used by learners at home, at work and in the community.

There is evidence to suggest that some CLC adult learners already possess basic functional literacy skills upon entry into programs and are seeking more advanced literacy education. For instance, about 25% of the learners were reported to be able to perform 7 everyday functional reading tasks without much difficulty before tutoring began. Moreover, of the 42 learners, 19% were reading at the fourth grade level or above. There are indications that the literacy education needs of these "intermediate" learners are not being met to the same degree as persons coming into programs with less in the way of functional literacy skills.

3. Do all adult learners experience a sense of personal, familial and/or cultural enrichment and do they become more capable of pursuing educational and employment opportunities?

As noted, most CLC adult learners demonstrate functional literacy skills improvement as a result of CLC program participation. As importantly, the majority of CLC adult learners link their skills improvement and program participation to some positive change in their lives. Between 25% and 32% of learners report changes in their educational goals, job situations and family life. Sixty-five percent of learners report changes in the way they use their leisure time, with most reporting an increase in time spent reading. Forty-four percent report they spend more time reading with family members, most often with their children. Moreover, a positive and significant statistical correlation was found to exist between learner skills improvement and learner-reported changes in family life.

Again, a longitudinal evaluation design would be needed to determine the long-term impact of literacy program participation upon learner educational and employment goals and achievements. However, several PER II learner/tutor pairs reported learner enrollment in more formal educational programs. Also, several reported positive learner job changes, and several more learners were preparing themselves to take advantage of promotional

opportunities or move into new career fields. These results suggest that, for some learners, increased formal education and improved job status may be outcomes associated with literacy program participation.

4. Do CLC instructional methods and materials address the functional literacy needs presented by the adults who participate in the programs?

CLC programs use a wide variety of materials that 97% of the PER II learners and tutors rated "good" or better. Most learners and tutors report substantial individualization of instruction, with about half the matched pairs reporting that goals for tutoring were set. Additional evidence that curricula is being modified to meet learner needs comes from the range of items that both learners and tutors report learners can read or write now that they could not read or write before tutoring.

PER II results suggest that CLC learners and tutors do not generally agree on the goals for tutoring. When they do agree on the goal, learners and tutors do not concur on the degree to which the goal has been achieved. The implication of this lack of agreement was explored in Chapter 4 and bears repeating because of its probable impact on the learner/tutor relationship and on service outcomes. Different interpretations of short- and long-term goals may lead to frustration for both the tutor and the learner, and may alter satisfaction with the tutoring experience and perceptions of progress for both.

Results also indicate that 42% of the learners would like more hours of instruction each week. While the one-to-one approach is used with most all adult learners, the resources it demands may be limiting the amount of instruction that programs are able to deliver and thus reducing learner opportunities for skills improvement. Other possible factors related to this unmet learner desire for additional tutoring may include CLC program reliance on volunteers for the provision of tutoring, temporal constraints imposed by learners and tutors, and inadequate availability or utilization of supplemental instructional resources.

5. Are local communities providing leadership, participation, support and funding for CLC programs?

information provided by the California State Library indicates that CLC programs are enjoying widespread community leadership, participation and support (see Appendix 4). Leadership for all programs is community-

based, although only two PER II learners reported being involved in program leadership positions. Coalition building is progressing well, with a variety of innovative projects underway, both at the local level and on a regional and a state-wide basis. The latter includes the California Alliance for Literacy, a coalition of organizations from the public and private sectors actively engaged in promoting literacy efforts throughout the State and attempting to bring increased coordination and cooperation to these efforts.

The State Library reports that CLC exceeded its goals for in-kind resources and volunteer instructional hours in FY86. However, local takeover of funding responsibilities is an area in which progress is not being made as hoped. Several programs have decreased dependency on State funds, both through private and public resources. Most, though, have yet to adequately address financial needs related to achieving the CLC goal of local program independence from State funding by the sixth year of program operations.

The State Library recognizes the difficulty that CLC programs face in securing local funding, particularly given the State's depressed agricultural economy and the various tax limitations contained in the State Constitution. This is an area of development which will require additional leadership and assistance from the State Library to its local library literacy programs.

B. Recommendations for Program Modifications

1. Clarify target population and modify program operations to better meet the needs of more skilled and less skilled learners

CLC adult learners are a heterogeneous group of people with functional literacy skills ranging from none to considerable. At one end of the skills continuum are adult learners who, in spite of their possession of basic everyday reading skills, are choosing CLC programs over more traditional adult basic education programs for improving their reading and writing capabilities. CLC should formally recognize the delivery of services to these "intermediate" learners and train tutors to teach more advanced literacy skills, such as reading in the content areas, study skills, and business writing.

At the other end of the skills continuum are the "harder to reach, harder to teach" learners of Group III, who possess few functional literacy skills. (See Chapter II, Section C-8.) CLC is to be commended for its recent

decision to emphasize service delivery to these less educated, lower income people. However, PER II results indicate that less than 5% of the CLC adult learner population is made up of such persons. CLC will have to devise and implement more innovative and intensive program development strategies to secure and retain the participation of learners of this type. Anecdotal evidence from evaluative work done elsewhere in the country by the PER II principals indicates several possibilities in this regard, all of which involve recruiting and tutoring learners within close proximity of where learners lead their lives.

People classified as "Group III" adult learners are persons who spend considerable time, effort and energy in attempting to meet their "basic" needs in relation to food and shelter. They are usually either unemployed, underemployed, or employed in low-paying jobs. Social activities most often occur either in the context of the family, the neighborhood, religious activities, and/or the underfunded programs designed to assist these people in meeting their basic needs or addressing major life problems.

Accordingly, CLC efforts to attract these people might be more successful if literacy programs were linked with other human service programs utilized by these people. Examples include job training, day care, community action, and substance abuse treatment programs. Perhaps of even more potential success would be the development of literacy programs with the sponsorship and participation of religious institutions located in the neighborhood communities in which these people live. The most promising possibility would be the development of employer-sponsored literacy programs for employees in minimum-wage, entry-level positions conducted at their job sites and, if feasible, on company time.

In any of the just-described program development possibilities, tutors should be recruited from among people the adult learners know and trust (i.e., neighbors, human service workers, fellow members of their religious institutions, or fellow employees). Tutoring should occur at a time and place of convenience to the adult learner, with the provision of transportation and child care services when needed. In order to attract tutors to work in this type of program, it may well be necessary to pay them, as the type of tutor desired might otherwise not be able to participate.

Given these possibilities and contingencies for developing local literacy programs for Group III adult

learners, it is obvious that such programs will require more in the way of financial resources than are presently allocated to CLC programs. Given the additional cost and the fact that such programs do not currently exist in CLC, it is recommended that a demonstration project be funded to develop such a program, with a strong evaluation component so as to allow for replication of the program elsewhere.

2. Develop and implement standard procedures for measuring and reporting adult learner progress

CLC has already determined to make this recommendation a priority for FY87. Ideally, such procedures would involve CLC in the development and validation of an instrument that could be used by each local literacy program. The results of initial, periodic and final learner evaluations would be sent to CSL where data would be compiled and analyzed. There have been previous attempts to develop such instruments in the field, with some degree of disputed success. However, development of such an instrument so as to meet acceptable standards of reliability and validity would be costly and take several years even with an adequate allocation of funds for this purpose.

In the interim, a "learner status" instrument could provide valuable information for evaluating CLC at the local and State level, facilitating learner/tutor instructional planning, and for eventually developing a reliable and valid formal assessment instrument. The learner status instrument would ask learners and tutors to agree on the learners' ability to perform certain literacy tasks in a manner similar to that used in PER II for assessment of functional literacy skills. The instrument would also ask learners their status in certain other areas of their lives (with regard to employment, use of leisure time, feelings of self-esteem, health, family life, etc.) and would make it clear that responses to these more personal questions were optional. The instrument would be designed to be usable without extensive training, to result in goal setting, and to be completed within an hour. The instrument could be initially designed using portions of the PER II Adult Learner Interview Guide as a model (see Appendix V) and then field-tested in willing programs with relative expediency.

In developing measures of functional literacy, it is important to remember that learner self-assessment of competence in performing a functional literacy task may

not correspond to learner ability to read every word in the material or to learner ability to explain every concept. For example, learners who report that they can read a board menu at McDonald's with little or no difficulty may be able to use the information on the menu without a problem. However, these learners may not be able to read every word on the menu. Therefore, objective judgments of competence must be judgments of learner ability to adequately use the printed information.

3. Improve tutor training in interpersonal communications, particularly in relation to goal setting with the adult learner

A comparison of PER I and PER II results indicate increased use of goal-setting as an instructional strategy in CLC programs. However, half of CLC adult learners never establish goals while in tutoring. Moreover, among those who do, there is evidence that tutors may lack the skills necessary to assist learners in establishing goals which are reasonable, achievable and meaningful.

In order to address this situation, CLC programs should train tutors in the nature and use of interpersonal communications skills. Such training would help tutors to develop the attending and responding skills necessary for encouraging learners to articulate their learning expectations and goals. This portion of tutor training might come early in the initial training workshop and then be referred to frequently thereafter, particularly in role-playing as tutors practice working with learners to set goals. Training and use of adult learner volunteers in such role-playing would probably enhance the effectiveness of such training.

Following initial tutor training, learner/tutor coordinators, specially trained in inter-personal communications, would work with individual learner/tutor pairs. These coordinators would meet with pairs at the start of the tutoring relationship and then at regular intervals while tutoring continues. These meetings could serve several purposes, including: completion of the learner status reports (referenced in the preceding recommendation); establishment and clear communication of tutoring goals and strategies for achieving them; and monitoring of tutoring relationships for the provision of positive reinforcement to both tutors and learners, as well as the provision of assistance so as to more readily improve the effectiveness of tutoring.

4. Increase the availability and utilization of supplementary instructional methods and materials.

Some CLC programs offer small group and classroom instruction in addition to one-to-one tutoring. Paid staff are often used to provide such instruction, with adult learners frequently involved in both individual and group instruction. Several CLC programs use computer-assisted instructional methods being developed on a demonstration basis with the help of Federal funding. Both are good examples of how learner functional literacy skills development may be enhanced through the use of methods and resources which supplement and complement one-to-one tutoring. Other possibilities include:

- The use of video and audio cassettes for reviewing skills presented in tutoring sessions or for acquiring information otherwise available only in inaccessible print;

- Use of peer instructors in the conducting of small group study sessions to assist learners with homework assignments, with training and back-up from paid or volunteer tutors;

- The provision of short courses on topics of specific interest to small groups of learners, such as current events, raising children, and the Bible; and

- The periodic or regular conducting of small group workshops for specific skills development in such areas as securing public financial assistance, job-hunting, and using the newspaper.

CLC should increase the availability and utilization of such supplementary instructional methods and materials so as to address the desire of adult learners for additional instruction in a more cost-effective manner than would be afforded by increasing the number of volunteer and paid tutors. Use of such methods and materials in conjunction with one-to-one tutoring may also increase the effectiveness of instruction for some adult learners.

5. Develop strategies for promoting greater adult learner participation in the leadership of literacy programs.

About one-fifth of CLC adult learners successfully recruit new learners into their programs. Yet, outside of possible contributions to program newsletters, only five percent of CLC adult learners engage in formal public communications activities conducted by their

literacy programs. Less than two percent serve on literacy program committees or local literacy coalitions.

This relative lack of consumer involvement in the operation and leadership of local literacy programs appears to be incongruous with the CLC mission of enabling these persons to better access information and ideas. Presumably such improved access should lead adult learners to more knowledgeable and active participation in the events and institutions which affect their lives. The local library literacy program would seem to be one of the more logical places in which to promote such participation, especially given the program emphasis on meeting the needs of its consumers, namely its adult learners. At the very least, the success of CLC adult learners in recruiting new learners would indicate that programs might well find adult learners to be valuable contributors to the planning and enactment of program development strategies.

Every literacy program board, committee, and coalition should include among its members an adult learner who is receiving or has received CLC program services. The most likely candidates are adult learners who have experienced skills improvement and life enhancement as a result of their program participation.

C. Recommendations for Future Evaluations

1. Conduct program effectiveness reviews on an annual basis and narrow the focus of each review

The California State Library is to be applauded for its commitment to periodically determining the effectiveness of CLC program operations through the conducting of third-party evaluations and using the results to modify program operations. Such evaluations should be conducted on an annual basis so as to continue and facilitate the CLC program improvement demonstrated between PER I and PER II.

PER I and, to a somewhat lesser extent, PER II assessed the entire operational system of the California Literacy Campaign, both as to its program components and service outcomes. Future program effectiveness reviews should be narrowed in focus so as to more adequately answer the unresolved questions raised by PER II. These questions include:

- What is a reliable and valid method for assessing adult learner progress?

- What are the characteristics of adult learners who make the most progress (inclusive of entry-level skills, goals for participation, etc.)?

- To what extent does participation in supplementary literacy instruction activities (in addition to one-to-one tutoring) promote learner progress?

- To what extent does learner/tutor agreement on goals and strategies for achievement promote learner progress?

- What is the nature of the relationship between learner progress and learner gender and employment status?

- What are the literacy skills and demographic characteristics of program drop-outs?

- What happens to adult learners who leave the program having met their goals?

- To what extent do functional literacy skills learned in the literacy program allow adult learners to handle the functional literacy demands they face in their daily lives?

2. Objectively assess learner pre- and post-tutoring functional literacy skills and the impact of program participation on the learner's life situation.

   An accurate assessment of progress depends upon the availability of objective pre- and post-tutoring data. Future evaluations could secure this data in one of several ways. If all CLC programs use a learner status report instrument, results could be collected for randomly selected learners. If such data is not available, evaluators could randomly select a very small number of new learners for assessment. The evaluators would then assess these learners before they began working with their tutors and would re-assess them every few months and at the end of their participation. These assessments would include information on both functional skills improvement and life enhancement measures. Any attempt to ascertain the long-range effects of literacy program participation would necessitate tracking these learners over an extended period of time beyond their time in the program.

3. For evaluations involving more than 25 respondents restrict the use of open-ended questions

For large-scale surveys, interview guides and questionnaires should have pre-coded responses based on previous evaluation findings for each item, with an "other" category for unanticipated responses. When a comparison of learner/tutor responses to the same question is of interest, open-ended responses make it impossible to know if the pairs truly did not have the same information or perception or if they simply happened to mention different, but important pieces of information. Coding difficulties and interpolation of the evaluators' subjective analysis of the respondent's intended meaning may obscure the respondent's experience. This problem clearly jeopardizes the validity of the findings.

If questions are asked for which little in the way of expected responses are known, the open-ended format must necessarily be used. However, the number of such questions for any particular evaluation should be limited and asked of no more than 25 respondents. The results from such exploratory inquiry can then be used to formulate pre-coded responses when asking the questions in the next evaluation of a larger number of respondents.

4. Begin planning Program Effectiveness Review III twelve months prior to due date for final report.

From the initial planning meeting with CSL staff to the submission of the final report, PER II took just over six months. The short time frame resulted in the elimination of some adult learners from possible participation in the evaluation, the inability of programs to secure participation agreements from some adult learners selected to the samples, the overuse of open-ended questions in the survey instruments, a piece-meal approach to the draft-and-review process, several contract extensions, and a number of overly extended work days for CSL and WAA personnel. Such problems can be avoided in Program Effectiveness Review III by initiating planning and design activities twelve months prior to the due date for the final draft.

REFERENCES

"Adult Literacy: Study of Community Based Literacy Programs," Washington, D.C.: Association for Community Based Education (September 1983)

"Carlsbad City Library Adult Learning Program Survey of Participants (January 1985 - June 1985)," San Diego, CA: San Diego Association of Government (February 1986)

Hunter, Carmen St. John, and David Harmon, Adult Illiteracy in the United States, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company (1979)

Lane, Martha A., and Jean F. McGuire, Christine H. Yeannakis, and Mark F. Wurzbacher, "California Literacy Campaign Program Effectiveness Review II," Sacramento, CA: California State Library (October 25, 1984)

Pulling, Jane Higdon, "A Descriptive Study of Tutor Training Practices, Procedures, and Materials in an Adult Literacy Program Utilizing Volunteer Tutors," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA (1979)

Stauffer, John M., The NALA Study, Syracuse, NY: New Readers' Press (1973)

Wurzbacher, Mark F., and Christine H. Yeannakis, "Lutheran Church Women's Volunteer Reading Aides Evaluation Project: A Study of Volunteer Adult Basic Literacy Organizations in the United States and Canada with Recommendations for the Provision of Technical Assistance," Philadelphia, PA: Lutheran Church Women, Lutheran Church in America (September 20, 1982)

APPENDIX 1

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY THE CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN 1985

Alameda County Free Library
- Castro Valley
- Fremont
- Hayward
- Newark
- Pleasanton
- San Lorenzo
- Union City

Alameda Free (City) Library
- Alameda

Auburn-Placer County Library
- Auburn
- Colfax
- Foresthill
- Lincoln
- Tahoe City

Butte County Library
- Chico
- Gridley
- Oroville
- Paradise

Carlsbad City Library
- Carlsbad
- Oceanside

Commerce Public Library
- Commerce

Contra Costa Public Library
- Antioch
- Clayton
- El Cerrito
- Lafayette
- Martinez
- Oakley
- Orinda
- Pinole
- Pittsburg
- Pleasant Hill
- San Pablo

Downey City Library
- Downey
- South Downey

Eureka-Humboldt County Library
- Eureka
- Samoa Peninsula

Fresno County Library
- Fresno

Hemet Public Library
- Hemet

Imperial County Free Library
- Brawley
- El Centro
- Imperial County communities

Kern County Library
- Arvin/Lamont
- Bakersfield
- Delano
- Ridgecrest/China Lake

Long Beach Public Library
- Long Beach

Los Angeles County Public Library
- Baldwin Park
- Carson
- Compton
- Cudahy
- Huntington Park
- LaVerne
- Lawndale
- Lynwood
- Montebello
- Norwalk
- Paramount
- Pico Rivera
- Quartz Hill
- San Fernando
- San Gabriel
- Southgate
- Woodcrest

Los Angeles Public Library
- Baldwin Hills
- Los Angeles
- Memorial
- Pacoima
- R.L. Stevenson
- Vernon
- Watts
- West Los Angeles
- West Valley
- Wilmington

Marin County Free Library
- Larkspur
- Marin City
- Mill Valley
- Novato
- San Anselmo
- San Rafael
- Sausalito
- West Marin

Mendocino County Library
- Anderson Valley
- Covela
- Hopland
- Fort Bragg
- Point Arena
- Potter Valley
- Ukiah
- Willits

Menlo Park Public Library
- Menlo Park

Merced County Library
- Atwater
- Ballico
- Dos Palos
- Gustine
- LeGrand
- Livingston
- Los Banos
- Merced
- Planada
- Winton

Modoc County Library
- Adin
- Alturas
- Davis Creek
- Likely
- Lookout
- Newell
- New Pine Creek
- Surprise Valley

(Monterey Park) Bruggemeyer Memorial Library
- Monterey Park

Napa City-County Library
- American Canyon
- Angwin
- Calistoga
- Lake Berreyessa area
- Napa
- Oakville
- Pope Valley
- Rutherford
- St. Helena
- Yountville

National City Public Library
- National City

Oakland Public Library
- Elmhurst
- Oakland
- Temescal
- West Oakland

Palm Springs Public Library
- Cathedral City
- Desert Hot Springs
- Palm Desert
- Palm Springs
- Rancho Mirage

Pasadena Public Library
- Pasadena

Placentia Library District
- Anaheim
- Buena Park
- Fullerton
- Huntington Valley
- Newport Beach
- Orange
- Placentia
- Yorba Linda

Richmond Public Library
- Richmond

Riverside City & County Public Library
- Riverside

Sacramento Public Library
- Citrus Heights
- Del Paso Heights
- Fair Oaks
- North Nighlands
- Oak Park
- Rancho Cordova
- Rio Linda
- South Sacramento

Salinas Public Library
- El Gabilan
- Santa Lucia

San Bernardino County Library
- Apple Valley
- Barstow
- Chino
- Hesperia
- Lucerne Valley
- Twentynine Palms
- Yucaipa

San Diego County Library
- Lemon Grove
- Poway
- Ramona
- Santee
- Vista

San Francisco Public Library
- San Francisco

San Luis Obispo City-County Library
- Baywood Park/Morro Bay
- Five Cities area
- North County
- San Luis Obispo

San Mateo Public Library
- San Mateo

Santa Ana Public Library
- Santa Ana
- South Santa Ana

Santa Clara County Free Library
- Gilroy
- Milpitas
- Morgan Hill

(Santa Paula) Blanchard Community Library
- Santa Paula

Shasta County Library
- Anderson
- Burney
- Cottonwood
- Fall River Mills
- French Gulch
- Oak Run
- Redding
- Whitmore

Siskiyou County Public Library
- Happy Camp
- Newell
- Tulelake
- Yreka

South San Francisco/Daly City Public Libraries
- Daly City
- South San Francisco

Stockton-San Joaquin County Public Library
- East Stockton
- South Stockton

Ventura County Library Services Agency
- Fillmore
- Moorpark
- Ojai
- Saticoy
- Ventura

Watsonville Public Library
- Watsonville

Woodland Public Library
- Woodland

CLSA/CLC:slm
rev. 9/5/85

APPENDIX 2:

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

PROGRAM LOCATIONS

PROGRAM LOCATIONS

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

1. Alameda County Free Library
2. Alameda (City) Free Library
3. Auburn-Placer County Library
4. Butte County Library
5. Carlsbad City Library
6. Commerce Public Library
7. Contra Costa County Library
8. Downey City Library
9. Eureka-Humboldt County Library
10. Fresno County Free Library
11. Hemet Public Library
12. Imperial County Free Library
13. Kern County Library
14. Long Beach Public Library
15. Los Angeles County Public Library
16. Los Angeles Public Library
17. Marin County Free Library
18. Mendocino County Library
19. Menlo Park Public Library
20. Merced County Library
21. Modoc County Library
22. Monterey Park Library
23. Napa City-County Library
24. National City Public Library
25. Oakland Public Library
26. Palm Springs Public Library
27. Pasadena Public Library
28. Placentia Library District
29. Richmond Public Library
30. Riverside City-County Public Library
31. Sacramento Public Library
32. Salinas Public Library
33. San Bernardino County Library
34. San Diego County Library
35. San Francisco Public Library
36. San Luis Obispo City-County Library
37. San Mateo County Library
38. San Mateo Public Library
39. Santa Ana Public Library
40. Santa Clara County Free Library
41. (Santa Paula) Blanchard Community Library
42. Shasta County Library
43. Siskiyou County Public Library
44. South San Francisco/Daly City Public Libraries
45. Stockton-San Joaquin County Public Library
46. Ventura County Library Services Agency
47. Watsonville Public Library
48. Woodland Public Library

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY

7 / 85

APPENDIX 3:

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

CONTACT LIST

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN

Gary E. Strong
State Librarian
(916) 445-4027

Nancy Percy
Assistant State Librarian
(916) 445-3831

Yolanda J. Cuesta
Bureau Chief
(916) 322-0372

CONTACT LIST
Coordinators

Alameda County Library
Irene Yarrow
3121 Diablo Avenue
Hayward, CA 94545
(415) 881-6337, ext. 252

Alameda Free Library
Dimity L. Jefferis
444 Central Ave., Room 22
Alameda, CA 94501
(415) 865-2454

Auburn-Placer County Library
James Elsaas
350 Nevada Street
Auburn, CA 95603
(916) 823-4168

Butte County Library
Jeannette Richard
1820 Mitchell Avenue
Oroville, CA 95966
(916) 534-4535

Carlsbad City Library
Adult Learning Center
Lynda L. Jones
1207 Elm Avenue, Suite O
Carlsbad, CA 92008
(619) 729-3690

Commerce Public Library
Cathay Reta
5655 Jillson Street
Commerce, CA 90040
(213) 722-READ (7323)

Contra Costa County Library
Carole Talan
1750 Oak Park Boulevard
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
(415) 944-3358

Downey City Library
Pam Alger
11121 Brookshire Ave., CN 7015
Downey, CA 90241
(213) 923-3258

Eureka-Humboldt County Library
Lilli Sommer
517 Third Street, Room 5
Eureka, CA 95501
(707) 445-3655

Fresno County Free Library
Carol Wilson
2420 Mariposa Street
Fresno, CA 93721
(209) 488-3871

Hemet Public Library
Jackie Pleasnick
510 East Florida Avenue
Hemet, CA 92343
(714) 658-9411, ext. 276

Imperial County Free Library
Lyvier Conss
1647 West Main Street
El Centro, CA 92243
(619) 352-8541

-over-

Kern County Library
Pat Osbey
1315 Truxton Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301
(805) 861-2130, ext.26

Long Beach Public Library
Ruth Stewart
560 East Hill Street
Long Beach, CA 90806
(213) 591-9409

Los Angeles County Public Library
Marilee Marrero
7400 East Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90241
(213) 922-7801

Los Angeles Public Library
Suzanne N. Johnson
1636 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90047
(213) 750-3573

Marin County Free Library
Philip MacDonald
Civic Center
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 499-7473

Mendocino County Library
Roberta Valdez
105 N. Main Street
Ukiah, CA 95482
(707) 463-4155

Menlo Park Public Library
Judy Wilczak
800 Alma Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(415) 321-8818

Merced County Library
Emiko Tanioka
2100 - O Street, Room 206
Merced, CA 95340
(209) 385-7412

Modoc County Library
Jim Halverson
212 West Third Street
Alturas, CA 96101
(916) 233-3939, ext. 330

(Monterey Park) Bruggemeyer
Memorial Library
Naomi Quinonez
318 South Ramona Avenue
Monterey Park, CA 91754
(818) 307-1251

Napa City-County Library
Frances Williams
1150 Division Street
Napa, CA 94559
(707) 253-4283

National City Public Library
Jose Cruz
300 East 15th Street
National City, CA 92050
(619) 474-2142

Oakland Public Library
Christine Saed
125 - 14th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 273-3432

Palm Springs Public Library
James Fleming
300 S. Sunrise Way
Palm Springs, CA 92262
(619) 320-2980

Pasadena Public Library
Victoria Johnson
285 East Walnut Street
Pasadena, CA 91101
(818) 405-4034

Placentia Library District
David Snow, Library Director
411 East Chapman Avenue
Placentia, CA 92670
(714) 528-1925

Richmond Public Library
Sharon Pastori
Civic Center Plaza
Richmond, CA 94804
(415) 620-6565

Riverside Public Library
La Sierra Branch
Jeneice Sorrentino
4600 La Sierra Avenue
Riverside, CA 92505
(714) 688-9302

-over-

Sacramento Public Library
Del Paso Heights Branch
Kay Christian
920 Grand Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95838
(916) 927-0900

Salinas Public Library
Salinas Adult Reading Program
Pat Jones, Santa Lucia Library
615 Williams Road
Salinas, CA 93905
(408) 758-7340

San Bernardino County Library
Joyce Lenoir
104 W. Fourth Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0035
(714) 387-5730

San Diego County Library
Peg Trivison
5555 Overland Avenue, Bldg. 15
San Diego, CA 92123
(619) 565-3577

San Francisco Public Library
Olive Gamble
Civic Center
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 621-READ (7323)

San Luis Obispo City-Co. Library
Lyn Vivrette
3240 S. Higuera, Suite B
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 541-4219

San Mateo Public Library
Marina Branch
Maura Okamoto
1530 Susan Court
San Mateo, CA 94403
(415) 341-3425

Santa Ana Public Library
Paula Pichon
122 North Newhope
Santa Ana, CA 92703
(714) 554-3455

Santa Clara Co. Free Library
Milpitas Branch Library
Brenda Gray
40 N. Milpitas Boulevard
Milpitas, CA 95035
(408) 262-1349

(Santa Paula) Blanchard
Community Library
Virginia Aguirre
119 - North 8th Street
Santa Paula, CA 93060
(805) 525-2384

Shasta County Library
Tim Mallory
1855 Shasta
Redding, CA 96001
(916) 225-5376

Siskiyou County Library
Wendy Reynolds
719 Fourth Street
Yreka, CA 96097
(916) 842-5027

South San Francisco/Daly City
Leslie Shelton
840 West Orange
South San Francisco, CA 94080
(415) 877-5329

Stockton/San Joaquin County
Public Library
Pat Torbett
1325 North Center Street, #6
Stockton, CA 95202
(209) 941-2778

Ventura County Library
Services Agency
Bobette Host
651 East Main Street
Ventura, CA 93001
(805) 652-7511

Watsonville Public Library
Margaret Pedulla
310 Union Street
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 728-6003

Woodland Public Library
Leslie Malek/Joan Kaplan
250 First Street
Woodland, CA 95695
(916) 661-3336

State Library Staff

Cameron D. Robertson
CLSA Program Manager
(916) 322-0374

Al Bennett, Literacy Specialist
(916) 322-0377

Paul Kiley, Community Organization Specialist
(916) 324-7358

Carmela Ruby, LSCA Consultant to the CLC
(916) 322-0366

Alice Mark, CLSA Program Analyst
(916) 322-0380

Sandi L. Martin, CLC Program Secretary
(916) 322-0378

Library Development Services Bureau
1001 - 6th Street, Suite #300
Sacramento, CA 95814-9998

Curtis Purnell, CLSA Fiscal Analyst
California State Library
P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237-0001
ATTN: CLSA Fiscal Office, Room 217A
(916) 445-5847

NOTE: All reporting forms are to be sent to the NEW MAILING ADDRESS of the Fiscal Office, above. Documents requiring special handling (UPS, Federal Express, etc.) must be mailed to the street address: California State Library, 914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814, ATTN: Fiscal Office, Room 217A.

(rev. 11/4/86)

APPENDIX 4:

CALIFORNIA LITERACY

CAMPAIGN UPDATE

Appendix 4

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN UPDATE

Following is a status report on California Literacy Campaign (CLC) activities. In practice, all program activities are integrated and coordinated to enable achievement of the campaign's goal: improved basic literacy skills for adults. However, for purposes of this report, program activities have been grouped into several categories, each of which is handled separately.

Administrative Overview

The California Literacy Campaign is a state-local partnership whose state funds are provided under provisions of the California Library Services Act (Chapter 1255, Statutes of 1977). Administrative authority and responsibility rests with the 13-member California Library Services Board (CLSB). Nine members of the Board are appointed by the Governor to represent various segments of the library community and population, with each house of the State legislature appointing two others to represent the public-at-large.

The CLSB establishes policies for the Campaign, determines the allocation of funds to participating library jurisdictions, establishes reporting procedures, and requests appropriations from the State. The State Librarian, as Chief Executive Officer of CLSB, is responsible for day-to-day operation of CLC and directs State Library staff in administrative, fiscal, and

support activities designed to implement the policies and decisions of the Board. Technical assistance and support services are provided by Library Development Services personnel holding the positions of Literacy Specialist and Community Organization Specialist. As in all CLSA-supported programs, participation by local jurisdictions in the Campaign is voluntary; CLC programs are currently operated by 47% of the State's 169 public library jurisdictions.

CLC provides participating library jurisdictions with certain guidelines for program operations and requires that they engage in certain planning and accountability activities. However, as one of the central tenets of the Campaign is local control and ownership of the literacy program, CSL has actively encouraged the participants to develop their own organizational development strategies for enacting the broad guidelines established by CLSB for the Campaign. As a result, CLC participants have had the opportunity to design and conduct programs adjusted to the characteristics and circumstances of their own jurisdictions with respect to the make-up and density of the local population, the nature and degree of literacy needs represented in that population, and the type and availability of other literacy resources in the local community.

Participation Overview

The California Literacy Campaign is presently comprised of 47 public libraries operating literacy programs in over 150

communities and 500 sites around the State. Statistics compiled by Library Development Services (LDS) from FY86 second quarter program reports indicate that, as of December 31, 1985, a total of 5,657 adult learners were being taught by 4,079 tutors.

The 18 original Phase II programs still receive CLSA funding and reported that, as of December 1985, 1,175 adult learners were being taught by 1,015 tutors. The three Phase III programs reported serving 72 adult learners with 69 tutors as of the end of December 1985. This was the first quarter in which these programs delivered instructional services to adult learners.

Instructional Program Overview

The California Literacy Campaign has as its focus the enhancement of basic literacy skills among persons aged 16 years and older who speak English in their daily lives. Accordingly, participating programs have been encouraged to adapt and design adult-oriented instructional techniques and materials for the development and improvement of basic written English skills. CLC programs can, for the most part, be characterized as to the prevailing instructional philosophy, methodology, and/or materials employed.

Among the 46 programs funded for 1985/86, 28 use the Laubach Literacy Action (LLA) Laubach Way to Reading (LWR) series, with varying adaptations, as their basic instructional curriculum. One program is an affiliate of Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA) and reportedly utilizes its tutor training procedures with

little variation. Four programs, although not formally affiliated with LVA, provide tutor training and learner instruction reported to be strongly influenced by LVA-developed approaches. Two programs are reported to have developed training and instructional strategies which represent a blended adaptation of both LVA and LLA methods and usage of materials from both. Three programs have developed instructional approaches heavily influenced by the works of Paulo Friere, and these, along with several others, appear to utilize training and instructional methods developed in large part from the educational experience and expertise of those directing the programs. In at least one, the instructional program has been developed from one being used in another state. Regardless of philosophical emphasis or curricular base, programs principally provide one-to-one tutor-to-learner instruction.

Public Communications Overview

From the inception of the California Literacy Campaign, the California State Library has considered local planning and implementation of public communications strategies to be crucial to both the recruitment of learners and tutors and the development of resources for financial and programmatic support. Local programs are reported to have made significant progress in this area, most notably in the growth of regional coalitions for public communications purposes, which have increased in number from two to nine over the past year. Moreover, both local and

regional public communications efforts have been characterized by increasingly diverse and sophisticated methods for accessing the media and attracting public interest, attention, and support, as exemplified below:

- In both 1985 and 1986, the twelve Bay Area programs collaborated in the execution of three-week radio/print campaigns. KCBS radio, with the largest market share of the Bay Area stations, created and broadcasted a documentary and public service announcement (PSA) which, along with a Safeway printing of a coordinated message on two million shopping bags, was designed to attract people to the programs. An 800 number was established and employed to provide efficient information and referral services for callers responding to this coordinated public communications effort.

- In the Sacramento broadcast area, five CLC programs engaged in a six-month public communications planning and development effort which resulted in the production and broadcast of five thirty-minute documentaries by the local CBS affiliate in April 1986. The area Broadcast Association collaborated in this effort by publicizing the five programs on radio and in the press, inclusive of publicity for the simultaneous "walks for literacy" taken through targeted neighborhoods in each of the five cities represented by the programs. Subsequent to this event, eleven other CLC

programs conducted similar "walk" or "run" events in their local jurisdictions.

- The programs in Long Beach, Contra Costa County, and San Luis Obispo County engaged local cable television resources for the creation and broadcast of PSAs, public affairs programming, and news updates about library literacy efforts. In Kern County, the area broadcast council has likewise become involved in providing public media message support for the Campaign. With local library assistance, NBC affiliates in Fresno and Los Angeles and ABC affiliates in San Diego, San Francisco, Sacramento, and Eureka have presented broadcasts on the problem of illiteracy and the success of people learning to read. Finally, twelve CLC programs are currently working with ABC and PBS stations in developing public awareness campaigns for FY87.

Coalition Development Overview

As indicated by the preceding discussion, the formation of local and regional coalitions is an integral and important element in the design and implementation of public communications strategies. However, these coalitions have significance beyond their use in public relations. CLC programs have been encouraged by CSL from their beginnings to create their own structure and process for attracting and utilizing influential public figures for increasing community involvement and participation in

organizational development efforts. Key players in the various local coalitions have included not only media representatives, but leaders from the business community, civic and church groups, health and human service agencies, and other educational programs and establishments, as well as program tutors and learners. Some of these coalitions have included corporate/community partnerships, such as those formed with Hewlett Packard, Trammel-Crowe, Chevron, and the local Private Industry Council by the Menlo Park Public Library, the Commerce Public Library, the Contra Costa County Library, and the Shasta County Library, respectively. Another type of community linkage has resulted in the Institutional/jail site tutor literacy programs developed by the Contra Costa County Library, San Luis Obispo City-County Library, and the Ventura County Library Services Agency.

Perhaps the most ambitious coalition building efforts were those undertaken by the National City Public Library in August, 1985, and the South San Francisco/Daly City Public Libraries in March, 1986, in which each sponsored and conducted a major community mobilization conference. Both conferences were characterized by: the inclusion of community leaders in planning and invitational activities; summary presentations of literacy program plans, accomplishments, and unmet needs; individualized solicitation of participant involvement in literacy program efforts; public announcements of commitment based upon these solicitations; and development of a meeting schedule for action on these commitments. Over 400 people attended these two

conferences. A local cable franchise in Daly City broadcast the entire event live and, in National City, the broadcast and print media both carried stories about the conference and its community awareness building activities.

Financial Development Overview

The long-range plan adopted by CLSB for the financing of CLC programs calls for an initial five-year period of State financial assistance for local jurisdictions. Under this plan, each program receives State funds for coverage of its annual operational expenses as follows:

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
75%	100%	100%	75%	50%

Although funding of the initial year's annualized operational budget is reduced in recognition of the time delays inherent in start-up, additional first year funds are available for needed materials and equipment. However, it is the intention that programs be wholly supported by local resources by the end of year five.

Financial (or resource) development activity is conducted and measured in relation to cash resources, dollar equivalents of in-kind resources, volunteer hours of instruction, and volunteer hours of "talent/support services" (defined by CSL as "time contributed to the literacy program in ways other than literacy

instruction"). Each year, individual programs establish goals in each of the latter three "resource development" areas and report progress toward achievement of these goals on a quarterly basis.

Figures from the 1985/86 second quarter reports of the 46 library programs indicate them to be on target for the year in relation to goals for in-kind resources and volunteer literacy instruction hours. Collectively, CLC programs have achieved 54.1% of their in-kind resource goal of $539,042 and 56.2% of their volunteer instruction goal of 324,548 hours. However, many programs have had little success in meeting their goals for talent/support services, such that, at the halfway point in the year, CLC programs have collectively achieved only 36.4% of their goal of 52,234 hours in this area.

Cash resource development is reported to have made gains in 1985/86, but information in this regard was incomplete as of the writing of this report. At least half the operating budget of the Oakland Public Library Second Start Adult Reading Program is funded by other than CLSA monies. A number of programs have received grants ranging from $5,000 to $10,000 each from such private resources as Fireman's fund Insurance, the Hearst Corporation, Pacific Telesis, and the Cable Television Foundation. Several programs have developed fledgling programs for securing funds through individual gifts and group donations. At least two programs have approached county officials and local foundations for operational monies. In most cases, however, CLC programs have yet to adequately address the need to achieve

financial independence from the State by their sixth year of existence.

APPENDIX 5:

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

(WITH RESPONSE COMPILATIONS)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section I: Identification and Interview Information
[for interviewer only]

Learner's Name: 104 adult learners Telephone Number: _____

Learner's Tutor: _____

Learner's Literacy Organization: From 31 literacy organizations*

Interviewer: _____ Date of Interview: _____

Time Started: _____ Time Completed: _____ Total Minutes: _____

Interviewer's Comments [to be completed at end of interview - for any information that interviewer feels would help evaluators to better understand the adult learner's responses - for example: person did not seem to understand English; person had difficulty responding to questions; person had someone else helping him/her to answer questions; person seemed to be in a hurry; etc.]:

*Alameda City (1), Alameda County (11), Butte (1), Commerce (2), Contra Costa (11), Downey City (2), Eureka-Humboldt (2), Hemet (6), Imperial County (3), Kern County (6), Long Beach (2), Los Angeles County (3), Menlo Park (2), Monterey Park (1), Napa City/County (2), Oakland (5), Pasadena (1), Richmond (2), Riverside (2), Sacramento (3), San Bernardino (6), San Francisco (3), San Luis Obispo (4), San Mateo (3), Santa Ana (4), Santa Clara (1), Santa Paula (6), Shasta (2), Siskiyou (1), South San Francisco/Daly City (2), and Stockton (3)

Interviewer's Notes [for recording dates and times adult learner called when adult learner not contacted and results of call (e.g., phone disconnected, person moved, new phone number, best time to call back, etc.]:

Date	Time	Results of Call
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section II: Program Status and Literacy Needs
[for all adult learners interviewed]

There are five parts to this interview. This is the first part. In this first part, we want to find out if you are being tutored [taught] now. We also want to find out why you decided to get help with either your reading or writing [or with learning to read and write English]. We need this information to see if literacy [reading] programs in California are meeting the needs of adult learners like yourself.

A. Are you now taking reading lessons with a tutor [teacher] from the literacy [reading] program?

1. Yes 81

   a. Who is your tutor [teacher]? _____

   b. How long have been studying with him/her? $\bar{x}$ = 6 months

   [Go to B.]

2. No 23 Why not? 18 responses (below), 5 non-responses (NR)

   a. 0 Waiting for your first tutor [teacher]?

      1) How long have you been waiting? _____ [Go to B.]

   b. 1 Waiting for a new tutor [teacher]?

      1) How long have you been waiting? _____

      2) Who was your last tutor [teacher]? _____

      [Go to B.]

   c. 17 Not able to take reading lessons at this time?

      1) Would you mind telling us why you can't take part now?
      Work-related reasons (new job/hours/schedule) - 7
      Sick/disabled - 3 Finished course - 2 Other - 5

      2) Have you had a tutor [teacher] in the past? 1 NR

         a) No 2 [Go to B.]

         b) Yes 14 Who was your last tutor [teacher]? _____

         [Go to B.]

B. What is the name of your literacy [reading] program? 21 learners did not know program name; 73 gave program names, usually the "popular" one

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

C. Why did you decide to take reading and writing lessons? [Pursue the answer to this question a bit. There may be more than one reason. Check as many reasons as the learner gives.]

1. 72 Improve reading skills
2. 38 Improve spelling skills
3. 44 Improve writing skills
4. 20 Further my education (How? NR - 6)
5. 14 Improve job performance (How? Read work materials - 2)
6. 2 Get a job promotion
7. 25 Get a job/better job
8. 5 Read the Bible
9. 25 Learn to read/write English
10. 18 Learn to speak or converse in English
11. 2 Secure government services (i.e., welfare, benefits, etc.)
12. 27 Improve myself
13. 3 Improve standard of living
14. 3 Get a driver's license
15. 10 Help my child with his/her school work
16. 2 Read with my family
17. 16 Could not or did not learn in school, want to try again
18. 19 Other (specify: See page 3A)

Get HS diploma/GED - 9
Prep for/go to college - 4
Further my education - 1
Write job-related mats. - 2
Read work mats. in Eng. - 1
Understand job better - 1
Other - 2 NR - 6

D. When you started in the literacy program, what did you hope to get out of it? [FOR LEARNERS NOT YET TUTORED: What do you hope to get out of the literacy program?] [As with preceding question, pursue the answer a bit and check as many responses as the learner gives.]

1. 67 Improved reading
2. 41 Improved writing
3. 27 Improved spelling
4. 10 Read and write letters
5. 14 Read for pleasure
6. 11 Read the newspaper
7. 11 Read the Bible/prayer book
8. 3 Read cookbooks
9. 11 Read to my children/grandchildren, help them with homework
10. 11 To do better on my job
11. 1 To get a promotion at work
12. 20 To get a job/a better job
13. 18 Emotional satisfaction (feel better about myself, etc.)
14. 10 Educational advancement (GED, go to college, etc.)
15. 3 Gain greater awareness of current events and what is going on in the world
16. 7 Get around better (by being able to read street signs, maps, etc.
17. 1 Be able to use government services or get government benefits (i.e., job services, welfare, etc.)
18. 17 Read/write/speak/understand English
19. 13 Other (specify: See page 3A)

C.18. Other reasons for deciding to take reading and writing lessons

Improve pronounciation/grammar	- 3
Communicate better with others	- 3
Dyslexia	- 2
Couldn't read	- 2
Read newspaper	- 1
Read bills	- 1
Citizenship	- 1
Learn how to do things	- 1
Learn how to use computer	- 1
Understand English better	- 1
Be able to relocate	- 1
Write kids excuses for school	- 1
Was in accident, couldn't read or write anymore	- 1

C.19. Other things learners hoped to get out of being in literacy program?

Read specific items not listed	- 3
Communicate better with others	- 3
Perform specific writing tasks not listed	- 2
Take driver's test	- 1
Understand Sunday School lessons	- 1
Get one-on-one help	- 1
Use dictionary	- 1

E. People who come into the literacy program sometimes can't read at all. Sometimes they can already read some things. I want to get an idea of what you could read before you came into the literacy program. I have a list of seven things that people sometimes read. For each item, tell me if, before you started reading lessons, you could read and understand it: (1) With no problem; (2) Somewhat or a little bit; or (3) Not at all. If you can't remember, that's okay too. Now here's the list: [FOR LEARNERS NOT YET TUTORED: I want to get an idea of what you can read now. I have a list of seven things that people sometimes read. For each one, tell me if you can read and understand it: (1) With no problem; (2) Somewhat or a little bit; or (3) Not at all. If you don't know, that's okay too. Now, here's the list:]

Could [can] you:*	(1) Yes - with little or no problem	(2) Somewhat - a little bit, not completely, but enough to use information	(3) No - not at all, not enough to really understand	(4) Do not remember or know
1. Read the newspaper?	13	32	58	1
2. Read your bills?	51	20	28	5
3. Read street signs?	39	43	21	1
4. Read cooking directions on food products?	38	19	48	3
5. Read the menues at McDonald's?	54	20	29	1
6. Read notices from work?	27	26	38	13**
7. Read notes from your child's school?	25	15	35	29***

* Means (for columns 1-3): 1=2.45; 2=1.88; 3=1.81; 4=2.08; 5=1.78; 6=2.24; 7=2.46

**Includes not working, N/A, NR ***Includes no child in school, N/A, NR

Section III: Literacy Program Experience

[Question A. in this section is for all adult learners interviewed. All other questions in this section are to be asked only if the person is currently being tutored or has had a tutor in this program in the past. Any questions about tutoring or the tutoring relationship are to be asked in relation to the adult learner's present or most recent tutor. If the person has never met with a tutor in this program, ask first question and then go to Section VI.]

This is the second part of your interview. In this part, we want to find out how you got involved with the literacy [reading] program . We also want to talk with you about your experience as an adult learner with your tutor [teacher]). With this information, we will be able to see how programs are the same and how they are different. This will help us to get the "big picture" of what literacy programs in California look like.

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

A. How did you FIRST hear about the literacy [reading] program run by (name of adult learner's literacy group)? [If more than response, ask which source of information was the one that first or finally led them to calling the literacy program and resulted in their getting a tutor or teacher.]

1. 28 Television
2. 14 Radio
3. 9 Newspaper
4. 2 Posters (at malls, stores, post office, etc.)
5. 15 Library (sign, brochure, staff, etc.)
6. 15 Family member
7. 23 Friend
8. 9 School
9. 3 Church
10. 1 Employment/unemployment office
11. ___ Other - specify _____

B. Did anyone interview you before you first met your tutor [teacher]?

1. No 35 [Go to C.]
2. Yes 69 Who (name and/or position) See page 5A

C. Did anyone check your ability to read or write before you started taking lessons?

1. No 47 [Go to D.]
2. Yes 57 a. Who checked your abilities? See page 5A

b. How were they checked? See page 5A

c. What were the results? See page 5A

D. Do you happen to know what your reading level was when you started with the program?

1. No 69 [Go to E.]
2. Yes 35 a. What was it (by grade level)? $\bar{x}$ = 3.7 (n = 35)

b. How do you know (who told you)? See page 5A

E. After you first got in touch with someone at the reading program, how long was it before you received your first lesson from your tutor [teacher]?

1. 46 Less than two weeks
2. 37 Two to four weeks
3. 19 More than four weeks NR = 2

F. Do [did] you receive your lessons [may be more than one response]:

1. 97 One-on-one with your tutor [teacher]
2. 7 In a small group (2 to 6 persons)
3. 2 In a classroom setting (more than 6 persons)

B.2. Who interviewed you before you met your first tutor?

Program director/coordinator/supervisor	- 18
Program first assistant/secretary	- 3
Someone else from program	- 4
Tutor	- 1
Librarian/someone at library	- 10
Name (but no identifier given)	- 11
Don't know/don't remember/NR	- 22

C.2.a. Who checked your ability to read or write before you started taking lessons?

Program director/coordinator/supervisor	- 16
Program first assistant/secretary	- 3
Someone else from program	- 1
Tutor/teacher	- 5
Librarian/someone at library	- 6
Name (but no identifier given)	- 4
Don't know/don't remember/NR	- 22

NOTE: In 23 cases, person conducting interview also conducted check of ability to read or write.

C.2.b. How was your ability to read or write checked?

Reading (quiz, test, book, aloud, questions on paper, words, letters, comprehension, etc.)	- 43
Writing test	- 2
Spelling test	- 2
Reading and writing	- 5
Reading and spelling	- 3
Reading, writing, and spelling	- 1
Asked me what words I don't know	- 1

C.2.c. What were the results from the reading or writing check?

Not good/bad/poor/terrible/failed	- 5
Couldn't read/could read very little	- 2
Need help/tutoring	- 3
Fair/passed	- 2
Beginner/started in Skill Book 1	- 4
Grade level (2nd through 8th)	- 9
Don't know/don't remember/NR	- 32

D.2.b. How did you know your grade level? (Who told you your grade level?)

Program director/coordinator/supervisor	- 4
Program first assistant	- 1
Someone else from program	- 4
Tutor	- 3
Name (but no identifier)	- 8
Self	- 2
College	- 1
Don't know/don't remember/NR	- 12

NOTE: In 12 cases, learner was informed of grade level by person who interviewed him/her and checked his/her reading ability.

G. Did you have any say in deciding where and when to meet with your tutor [teacher]?

1. No 28 [Go to H.]
2. Yes 76 Are you meeting where and when you wanted to?
   a. 70 Yes
   b. 6 No

H. How often do [did] you meet with your tutor [teacher]?

1. 29 Once a week
2. 67 Twice a week
3. 7 Three times a week
4. 0 More than three times a week

I. Would you prefer [have preferred] to meet:

1. 42 More often ? How often? $\bar{x}$ = 2.0 times per week more
2. 0 Less often?. How often? _____ times per week less
3. 62 The same number of times we do now.

J. Where do [did] you meet with your tutor [teacher]?

1. 65 Library
2. 9 Your home
3. 12 Tutor's home
4. 8 School
5. 2 Business place
6. 3 Church
7. 0 Jail/prison
8. 5 Other (specify) _____

K. Would you rather meet [have met] at another place?

1. No 88 [Go to L.]
2. Yes 16 Where? Either quieter, more private place (usually rather than library) or at learner's home

L. About how many times have you met [did you meet] with your tutor [teacher]? (About how many hours of instruction have you had [did you have] from your tutor/trainer?)

1. 14 Less than 10 times [1. ___ Less than 10 hours]
2. 20 10 to 20 times [2. ___ 10 to 20 hours]
3. 14 21 to 30 times [3. ___ 21 to 30 hours]
4. 14 31 to 40 times [4. ___ 31 to 40 hours]
5. 6 41 to 50 times [5. ___ 41 to 50 hours]
6. 33 More than 50 times [6. ___ More than 50 hours]
7. 3 Do not know/can't remember

M. What do you think of the books and other materials that your tutor [teacher] uses [used] to help you learn? (How would you rate the books and other materials that your tutor [teacher] uses [used] to help you learn?)

1. 32 Excellent
2. 40 Very good
3. 26 Good
4. 3 Not very good
5. 0 Poor
6. 3 Other/additional response - specify: No response

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

C.2.b.1) Progress on goals not achieved (by goal set)

Secure HS diploma/GED	-Keep getting lessons (3) - On Skill Book 3 (3) - Can read signs, words, books (1) - Can read a little (1) - Too soon to tell (1) - Graduate in two months (1) - NR (3)
Read/write/spell better	- Almost there/good progress/doing really well/halfway there (4) - Learning to read/can read some/can read a little bit (3) - Learning to write/writing sentences (2) - Spelling improving (1) - In Skill Book 2 (1) - I keep going (1)
Achieve higher grade level	- Up to 6th grade level but have slowed down - Up to 8th grade level - Up to 8th grade level....reading more rapidly....comprehending more....improved spelling - Up to 12th grade level [from 10th] - Up to 12th grade level....was low to start - Up to 6th grade level [from 4th]
Get new job/enter new field	- Doing great (1) - A little progress/I can read some (1) - Almost ready to take [job certification] test (1) - Can read words in Bible [for person who wants to be a preacher] - Don't know (1)
Read books/newspapers	- In Skill Book 3 (1) - Almost there (1) - Can read some words now (1) - Learner quit program/not learning (1)
Prep for/go to college	- I keep going (1) - I go as much as my teacher will see me (1) - Maybe next year (1)
Write notes/letters/stories	- learning to read (2) - graduate [from high school] next month (1)
Get driver's license	- part way there (1) - can read some of road signs, some words, some of my tutoring books

C.2.b.2)

Goals achieved	New goal set
- Reached 6th grade reading level	- Go to college
- Understand what I read more quickly	- Learn to type (for changing job field from housekeeping to clerical)
- Function better in everyday life	- Secure high school diploma
- Can read newspaper	- Secure GED
- Secured GED	- None set
- Became U.S. citizen	- None set
- Passed job certification test	- None set

D.2.c. How were your reading/writing skills rechecked?

Reading test/quiz/to tutor/from books	- 23
Skill Book tests/checkups	- 8
Spelling test	- 7
Writing test	- 4
Word list	- 3
Project test book/teacher's test book	- 3
Unspecified written test	- 2
Unspecified test	- 5
Pronounciation	- 1
Use of dictionary	- 1
Group reading	- 1
Don't know/remember	- 4

D.2.d. What were the results from the rechecking of your reading/writing skills?

Excellent/very well/well/good	- 13
Improving/getting much better	- 9
Percentage (100%/98%/85%)/missed one/two/few	- 8
Passed/started new book/got certificate/star	- 6
Increased reading grade level	- 3
Not bad/OK/alright	- 3
Need to improve	- 1
Don't know/don't remember	- 14

F. Earlier in the interview [Section II, Questions C and D, on page 3], you said that when you came into the program, there were some things you were looking for, including some things you wanted to learn to read and write. [Go back and read person's response to these questions.] Has [did] the program helped [help] you in in the way you thought it would?

1. Yes 94 How so? See page 10A

2. No 10 Why not? See page 10A

G. What can you read or write now that you couldn't read or write before coming into the literacy program? Be as specific as you can.

Read/write/other (88%) Nothing (8%) Don't know (4%) See page 10A

H. Earlier, I asked you to what extent you could read certain things before coming into the program. Now I want to ask you the same questions. Can you:*

	(1) Yes - with little or no problem	(2) Somewhat - a little bit, not completely, but enough to use information	(3) No - not at all, not enough to really understand	(4) Don't know, have not tried
1. Read the newspaper?	32	48	20	4
2. Read your bills?	68	22	6	8
3. Read street signs?	68	27	17	2
4. Read cooking directions on food products?	57	26	15	6
5. Read the menues at McDonald's?	70	19	8	7
6. Read notices from work?	43	29	7	25**
7. Read notes from your child's school?	35	25	8	36***

I. What's the most important way in which the literacy [reading] program has affected your life? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: What was the most important way in which the literacy [reading] program affected your life?]

See page 10A

J. Have your educational goals or plans changed since you began taking reading lessons? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: Did your educational goals or plans change as a result of being in the literacy [reading] program?]

1. No 75 [Go to K.]
2. Yes 29 What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]

See page 10A

*/**/*** See page 10A

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

F.1. If being in literacy program helped, how so?

General basic skills improvement (improved reading, writing and/or spelling) - 35 (32%)

Specific basic skills acquisitions - 16 (14%)

- Can sound out words (7)
- Increased vocabulary (3)
- Learning parts of speech, grammar (3)
- Can use dictionary (2)
- Can count money (1)

Improved self-confidence - 16 (14%)

- "It has given me courage. I can learn to read"
- "I'm not afraid to pick up a book anymore."
- "I knew I could learn."
- "I don't fake it anymore."
- "I can read stuff and not get scared."
- "More comfortable"
- "Less shy"
- "Makes me feel good"
- "I feel much better about my self."
- "Confidence"/"Self-confidence"/etc.

Specific reading/writing improvements (other than those related to work) - 11 (10%)

- Can read magazines, books, general literature, newspaper, etc.
- Can understand text book
- Can understand Sunday School readings
- Can read words in Bible
- Can read books to my daughter
- Can write letters (3)

Work-related improvements - 10 (9%)

- "Can read work manual better"
- "I just got a raise on my job."
- "I can communicate better with people at work."
- "I can read notes from my boss and know better what to do at work."
- "Passed [trade] certification test"
- "Read at work"
- "Easier at work"
- Complete job applications, business forms, etc.

Improved understanding (of words/conversations/people/etc.) - 9 (8%)

Conversation/speaking improvements - 7 (6%)

- "By learning a second language, I can read and understand a lot more."
- "Speak English better"
- "Can talk to others better"

Other - 7 (6%)

- "Learning a bit" (2)
- "Passed my test for citizenship"
- "Fun to be able to sit down and read"
- "Learning a bit"
- "If I can stick with it, I think it can help me."
- "I'm getting help."
- "I'm not where I want to be yet. I want to learn more."

F.2. If being in literacy program did not help, why not?

- "I didn't go long enough.' (3)
- "I needed more learning [tutoring] time." (2)
- "I had to go [leave program]."
- "I didn't need so many tutors at school anymore."
- "The first two books, I did well, but by the third book I didn't get to read enough. [We were] spending too much time on maps and spelling. I wanted to spend more time on reading."
- No explanation (2)

G. Can read and write now that couldn't before

Read
- Books (36)
- Newspaper (24)
- Work materials (12)
- Words/numbers (9)
- Signs (8)
- Magazines (7)
- To children (6)
- Mail/letters (5)
- Instructions (4)
- Bills (3)
- Packages (2)
- General (2)
- Menues, compositions, flyers (1 each)

Write
- Letters (5)
- General (4)
- Words/phrases/sentences (3)
- Job applications (2)
- Grocery lists (2)
- Work-related materials (2)
- Checks/address/notes (1 each)

Other - Sound out words (3)
- Improved spelling (2)
- Better pronounciation (2)
- Talk/listen better (2)
- Break up words/count money/improved grammar/compare English and Spanish words (1 each)

H. Footnotes

*Means for columns 1, 2, and 3 for items:	Pre	Post
1. Newspaper	2.45	1.88
2. Bills	1.88	1.35
3. St. signs	1.81	1.40
4. Directions	2.08	1.57
5. Mac menues	1.78	1.36
6. Work notes	2.24	1.54
7. Sch. notes	2.46	1.60

**Includes not working, not applicable, no response
***Includes no child in school, not applicable, no response

I. Most important way that program has affected life

Increased self-confidence/self-esteem - 33

- "I used to be ashamed, but I feel good about myself now."
- "I can admit if I have a problem. I'm not afraid to ask questions anymore."
- "I hid this all my life....[The program] made me more sure of myself."
- "I feel more proud of myself."
- "It made me feel I can compete with others."
- "It gave me a better outlook on life."

Improved basic skills (reading/writing/spelling) - 27

Increased competence - 13

- "Being able to do more for myself. That's most important."
- "Knowing that I can learn....[and] proving it to myself with my tutor's help."
- "Understand my job better"
- "Sharper thinking"
- "Found job"
- "Helped me [do better] at work"
- "Don't have to ask people for help"
- "Now I can do more things than what I could do before."
- "Became a citizen"
- "Getting a [trade] license"

Improved social life - 10

- "I attend more social functions."
- "I'm more secure talking with others."
- "I enjoy going out more."

Improved social life (continued)

- "I've gotten to know more people."
- "Going out more"
- "Communicate better with others"

Improved family life - 6

- "Better relations with my kids"
- "Work with my kids"
- "Brought the family closer together"
- "Read to my kids"

Improved self-direction - 4

- "Going to college when I finish this course"
- "Going to get a job"
- "Improved my career outlook"
- "Feel like I've got someplace to go"

Other (basically positive) - 6

- Life "easier"/"more comfortable"/"more fun" (5)
- "Don't hate school so much anymore"

Other (basically negative) - 6

- Hasn't/didn't help (4)
- "Made me more anxious"
- "Still don't have that government job"

Don't know/can't tell yet - 9

J.2. Change in educational goals

- Decided to go to college/firmed up resolve to do so - 10
- Plan to study for particular occupational area - 5
- Plan to get GED/high school diploma - 3
- Get [trade] licensing/certification - 2
- Go back to school - 2
- Take more English - 2
- Read better - 1
- No elaboration - 4

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

K. Have there been any changes in your job situation or in your job plans for the future since you began taking reading lessons? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: Did any changes occur in your job situation or in your job plans as a result of your being in the literacy [reading] program?]

1. No 78 [Go to L.]
2. Yes 26 What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]

See page 11A

L. Has your family life changed any since you began taking reading lessons? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: Did your family life change at all as a result of your being in the literacy [reading] program?]

1. No 71 [Go to M.]
2. Yes 33 What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]
   - Family members glad/proud/encouraging/unashamed - 11
   - Can talk with children/grandchildren in English - 5
   - Help children with homework - 4
   - Other - 13

M. Since you began taking reading lessons, do you spend time [or more time] reading with members of your family? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: Did your being in the literacy [reading] program result in your spending time [or more time] reading with members of your family?]

1. No 60 [Go to N.]
2. Yes 44 Which family member(s)? Child/children/grandchildren/niece - 37; Spouse - 7; Parents - 3; Siblings - 3; Everyone - 3; In-laws - 2; Unrelated persons - 1

N. Do you use your free time any differently since you began taking reading lessons? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: Do you use your free time any differently as a result of having been in the literacy [reading] program?]

1. No 39 [Go to Section V]
2. Yes 65 How do you use your free time differently?

78 ways - see page 11A

Section V: Support for Participation in Literacy Program

[This section is for all adult learners who are currently being tutored or who received tutoring in the past.]

This is the fourth part of the interview. It is a short one. Here, we just want to know whether they are other people in your life who know about your learning goals and your participation in the literacy [reading] program. If there are, we want to know to what extent they have supported you in your efforts to improve yourself.

K. Changes in job situation or job plans

Present job improvements - 9

-got a raise - 2
- scheduled to take foreman/supervisor test - 2
- improved communications on the job - 2
- applied for a new position - 1
- improved paperwork - 1
- not afraid to take tests anymore - 1

Plan career changes - 8 (7 of whom tie these plans to educational plans)

Got a job/got a new job - 6

Looking for a job/a new job - 2

Scheduled to take [trade] licensing/certification exam - 2

More opportunities to advance - 2

N. How free time used differently

Read/read more/read more often - 28
Read books/read more books/read books instead of watch TV - 13
Studying/doing homework - 9
Read newspaper/read newspaper more/read more of newspaper - 5
Read magazines/read more magazines/read more of magazines - 5
Other - 18

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

A. Who do you go to if you need help with something that you can't read or if you need help in writing something? [If need be, ask for recent example of help sought and received to answer questions below.]

	Name (or initials)	Relationship to You	How Often? (per month)	For What?
1.				
2.				

B. Have you told any of your family or friends about your participation in the literacy program?

1. No 10 Why not? Embarassment - 2 Not comfortabe - 1 None of their business - 2 No reason given - 5

2. Yes 94 What close family members or friends have you told? [Up to four persons - then for each one] Has s/he helped you out in any way with your reading or in taking part in the literacy [reading] program and, if so, how? [For instance: practicing reading or writing; taking care of your child while getting lessons; driving to or from the place where you get your lessons; loaning you money for books and materials; giving you moral support, etc.]

	Relationship to You	Nature of Help or Support
a.		
b.		
c.		
d.		

C. Do you have any friends or relations who are involved in the literacy program either as tutors [teachers] or as adult learners?

1. No 80
2. Yes 24 Who are they? Did you meet them before or after you started in the literacy program? Do you get together with any of these people to do things outside of literacy program activities?

	Name (initials)	Relationship to You	Met? Before	Met? After	Do Things Together? Yes	Do Things Together? No	Types of Activities
a.							
b.							
c.							

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

B.2. Family and Friends Told and Support Given

	Nature of Support				
Persons Told	None	Moral support	Help with words/ pronounciation/ reading/writing/ spelling/homework	Provide childcare, transportation, housesitting	Also in program
Spouse	8	19	15	2	-
Children	14	31	13	2	-
Parents	3	26	6	1	-
Siblings	6	27	10	-	3
Friends	5	25	6	2	2
In-laws	-	6	3	1	-
Aunt/uncle	-	6	-	-	-
Cousins	1	5	-	-	-
Nephew/niece	1	1	-	-	-
Grandparent	-	1	-	-	-
Grandchild	-	1	-	-	-
Stepfather	-	1	-	-	-
Coworkers	-	1	-	-	-
Boyfriend's mom	-	-	1	-	-
Pastor	Reads Bible with me				
Housekeeper	Writes out checks				
Boss	Provides me with place and time to study				

C.2. Friends/relations involved in literacy program

See attached print-out

SECTION 5 INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS

	NAME	NAME	NAME	RELAT	RELAT	RELAT	MET	MET	MET	SEE	SEE	SEE	DO	DO	DO
5	Vern			friend			5			y			church		
6	Cathy			daugh er-i n-law			3			y			Cooking, shop		
14	Steve			friend			9			y			work		
16	Floyd	Ruby	Bogard	brother	friend	friend	0	0	0	y	n	n	everything		
23	Raoul			sister			1			n					
25	Joe			friend husband			1			y			everything		
26	Ruby Fo=			friend			0			y			Party together		
33	JR Vargas			brother			1			n					
35	Ricardo S	Isolona S	Abendao	friend	friend	friend	1	1	0	y	y	y	church-social	church-social	church-socia
36	Rud Swarz	Frank P.		brother	brother		0			n	n				
40	S.N.			friend			0			n					
42	Perry Tong			friend			0			n					
43	Fran Brock			friend			1			y			shopping		
45	Edeline			daughter			0			y			shopping		
46	Aja			friend			2			y			Everything		
54	Lonzo	Leo		brother	brother		1	1		y	y		get togethers	get togethers	
62	Hank			brother			1			n			knew from work		
64	Joanne R			friend			1			n					
76	Maria M			wife			1			y			everything		
77	Eddie S	Joe C	John	brother	nephew	friend		1		y	y	n	all	all	
90	Morana			friend			1			n					
97	Consuelo	Hilda G	Friends	wife sister	friend	friends	1	1				1	[illegible]	[illegible]	
102	Castalia	Tony	Jo	[illegible]	[illegible]	friend	2	1		1	1	y	[illegible]	[illegible]	
104	Gustavo	Marina	Granado	[illegible]	[illegible]	friend	2	1		n	n	n	[illegible]		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section VI: Personal Information

[You should ask the questions in this section of every person you interview. People may not want to give you some of this information as some of it is fairly personal. If the interviewee seems resistant to give you a particular piece of information, repeat the confidential nature of the interview. If the interviewee still does not want to answer the question, let the person know that is alright to do, mark it with a "NR" (no response) and go on to the next question.]

We have finally reached the last part of your interview. I just want to thank you a lot for all the time and thought you've given in your answers. I know this can be hard to go through, but you've done a great job. In this last part, we just want to find out a few things about you and what you do. Please remember that the information is confidential. This means no one but myself and the two evaluators will ever know what answers you gave to these questions. Your responses will be lumped together with the responses from the 99 other adult learners being interviewed to give us a picture of the "typical" adult learner involved in California literacy programs.

A. What is your sex? 1. Male 50 2. Female 54

B. How old are you?

1. 16-19 years 2 | 2. 20-29 years 28 | 3. 30-39 years 35
4. 40-49 years 17 | 5. 50-65 years 17 | 6. 65+ years 5

C. Are you married? 1. Yes 70 2. No 34

D. What is your race?

1. Caucasian 43 | 2. Asian 6 | 3. Hispanic 28 | 4. Black 22
5. Native American 1 | 6. Pacific Islander 2 | 7. Other 2

If "Other," please specify: _____

E. What was the last grade you completed in school?

1. Up to 4th grade 12
2. 5th to 8th grade 19
3. 9th to 11th grade 30
4. 12th grade 33
5. College 4

	Yes	No
a. High school diploma	33	
b. G.E.D.	1	

F. When you were in school, did you receive vocational training? NR = 2

1. No 88 2. Yes 14 In what occupational area(s) _____
Electronics (2); computers, nurse's aide, carpentry, homemaking, machine shop, secretarial, home economics, agriculture, job work program (1 each); NR (3)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

G. When you were in school, were you ever in special education?

1. No 59 2. Yes 45 In what type of program 37 gave responses relating to reading difficulties, 18 of whom also had remedial in other subject areas - 6 additional persons in classes for children labeled as "slow learners", learning disabled, "educationally handicapped"

H. Since you left school, have you ever been involved in another program in which you worked on your reading and writing skills?

1. No 61
2. Yes 41 a. What was the name of the program (or where did you go for tutoring/teaching)? See page 14A

b. How long you did you participate? $\bar{x}$ = 6 months

c. Why did you leave? See page 14A

I. 1. How many people live in your home? $\bar{x}$ = 4.0

2. For each person living in your home (other than yourself), please give me his/her age and relationship to you:

	Number of Children					
With children (n = 62)	1	2	3	4	5	6
With spouse*	12	16	8	3	1	2
With spouse/other relatives	3	1	1	1		
With spouse/friends		2				
No spouse	3	3	1		1	
No spouse/other relations		2				
No spouse/friends**	1	1				

*3 families include grandchildren
**1 family includes grandchild

With no children: (n = 42) With spouse - 15 With spouse/other relations - 2
With father/mother - 2 With father/mother/siblings - 2
With father/mother/siblings/other relation - 1
With father/mother/other relations - 1
With mother - 1 With mother/other relation - 1
With other relations - 4 With other relations/friends - 1
With friends - 4 With grandchildren - 1
Live by self - 6 Live at rescue mission - 1

J. What language do you speak at home? Three gave two languages

English 84 Spanish 14 Pilipino 1 Chinese 3
Other Taiwanese, Albanian, Persian, Italian, Guamanium (sp?)

K. What country were you born in? 1. United States 73 2. Other 26

If "Other," please specify Mexico (12); Taiwan (2); China (2); Philippines (2); Guam (1); Bermuda (1); Korea (1); Thailand (1); Jamaica (1); Hong Kong (1); Yugoslavia (1); Hawaii! (1); No response (5)

H.2.a. Previous Adult Reading Program

Adult education classes - 9
At colleges/universities (presume these are adult ed) - 12
Night school/at high schools (presume these are adult ed) - 7
ESL - 4
Other volunteer literacy programs - 3
Job corps - 1
Other - 1
Don't know/don't remember - 4

H.2.c. Reason for Leaving

Not learning/progressing - 6
Too advanced/over my head - 4
Lost interest/boring - 4
Work/job change - 4
Moved - 3
Cancelled - 3 (class too small - 2; proposition 13 - 1)
Didn't like it/not for me - 3
Got married/divorced - 2
Had children - 1
Was for people who couldn't speak English - 1
Safety reasons - 1
Not one-on-one - 1

Completed/finished/graduated - 3
Was helping me - 1
Still going - 1

No reason given - 3

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

L. Are you presently employed? NR = 15

1. Yes 66

a. Are you employed:

1) 51 Full-time
2) 4 Part-time but looking for full-time work
3) 11 Part-time and not looking for full-time work

Professional/managerial in large firms/proprietors - 6
Semi-professional, managerial in small firms - 5
Clerical/sales - 5
Skilled/semi-skilled labor - 30
Agriculture/unskilled labor - 19

b. What kind of work do you do (job title/brief description)?

65 gave job type (see above)

c. What type of company or business do you work for? 60 responses
Public sector (gov't/military/schools/college) - 9
Private sector (major corp. - GM/IBM/Chevron/PGE/Santa Fe RR) - 5
Private sector (local industry/service/franchise/sm. bus.) - 40
Private individuals - 3 Self-employed - 3

d. About how much do you make each year? _____

2. No 23 Are you looking for work? NR = 4

a. No 13 [Go to M.]
b. Yes 6 Have you applied for a job in the last month or so?

a. Yes _____ b. No _____

M. Are you a homemaker? 1. No 49 2. Yes 46 3. NR 9

N. Are you retired? NR = 5

1. No 92
2. Yes 7 From what type of job/company Fork lift operator; motel maid/housekeeper; prepared products; gas station owner; heavy equipment driver; farming; domestic for individuals

O. Are you a student? NR = 4

1. No 85
2. Yes 15 a. Full-time 0 What/Where? _____
b. Part-time 15 What/Where? Library (6); College (5); Home (2); Trade sch. (1) Church (1)

P. Do you have a disability that prevents you from working either part-time or full-time? NR = 7

1. No 93
2. Yes 4 Type _____

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Q. Are you the person who earns most of the money to keep your household going? NR = 2

1. Yes 45
2. No 57 Who is? Husband (29); equal/both (10); father/step-father (5); friend (2); mother/mother-in-law (2); wife/welfare (1); welfare (1); son-in-law (1); son and daugher (1); uncle (1); brother, sister, and me (1); husband and brother (1); everyone in house (1)

R. About how much money do the people in your household make over the course of a year? NR = 43

1. 2 Less than $5,000?
2. 5 $5,000 to $9,999?
3. 10 $10,000 to $14,999?
4. 10 $15,000 to $19,999?
5. 12 $20,000 to $29,999?
6. 22 $30,000 or higher?

S. Are you currently receiving any money from the government? NR = 4

1. No 76
2. Yes 24 What type of financial assistance do you get?
   a. 1 Social security
   b. 4 Supplemental security income (SSI)
   c. 9 Welfare
   d. 4 Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)
   e. 5 Medical assistance (Medicaid/Medicare/Medical)
   f. 2 Veteran's benefits
   g. 2 Disability benefits
   h. 1 Rent supplement
   i. 0 Job training
   j. 2 Other Unemployment, food stamps

APPENDIX 6:

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

(WITH RESPONSE COMPILATIONS)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I: Identification Information

We have filled in all but the last two items in this section. The adult learner we have identified is the one we want you to tell us about in Sections VI and VII.

Tutor's Name: 99 tutors

Learner's Name: Adult learners of 86 of these tutors were interviewed

Literacy Organization: 32 literacy organizations (see page 1A)

Date Questionnaire Completed: _____ Total Time to Complete: _____

++

Section II: Your Program Status and Experience

In this section, we want to know whether you are now tutoring or have tutored in the past or have been trained as a tutor but have yet to work with an adult learner. If you are tutoring or have tutored in the past, we ask that you complete the entire questionnaire. If you have yet to work with an adult learner, please complete only Question A in this section, the asterisked (*) questions in Sections III and IV, and all the questions in Section VIII.

A. Are you now tutoring in the above-named library literacy program?

1. Yes 82 [If "Yes", go to B.]
2. No 17 Why not?

a. 0 Waiting for your first adult learner?

1) How long have you been waiting? _____ [Go to B.]

b. 10 Waiting for a new adult learner?

1) How long have you been waiting? < 1 month - 8
> 1 month - 2

2) When did you last meet with the above-named adult learner?
< 1 month - 1 1 month - 2 2 months - 1 3 months - 1
5 months - 4 1 year - 1

3) Why did you stop tutoring him/her? Completed course - 2
(1 gave 2 reasons) Learner schedule conflicts - 2 Temporary interruption - 2
Learner got job - 2 Learner's lack of interest - 1
Tutor's personal problem - 2

c. 7 Another reason? Please explain: Learner got job - 1
Learner schedule conflicts - 1 Tutor moved - 1
Tutor burn-out - 1 Tutor personal problems - 3

Summary b. and c.: Tutor-related - 7 Learner-related - 7
"Graduated" - 2 Temporary halt - 2

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I Literacy Organization	Number of Tutors Returning Questionnaire	Number of Tutors Returning Questionnaire Whose Learner Interviewed
Alameda City	1	1
Alameda County	12	11
Butte	1	1
Commerce	1	1
Contra Costa	10	9
Downey City	3	3
Eureka-Humboldt	4	2
Hemet	6	6
Imperial County	4	2
Kern County	5	3
Long Beach	1	1
Los Angeles (city)	1	0
Los Angeles (county)	4	3
Menlo Park	1	1
Monterey Park	1	1
Napa City/County	3	2
Oakland	3	3
Pasadena	1	1
Richmond	2	2
Riverside	2	2
Sacramento	3	3
San Bernardino	5	5
San Francisco	1	0
San Luis Obispo	3	3
San Mateo	3	3
Santa Ana	4	4
Santa Clara	1	1
Santa Paula	4	4
Shasta County	3	2
Siskiyou	1	1
South San Francisco/Daly City	2	2
Stockton	3	3
TOTALS	99	86

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

B. How long have you been a tutor with this library literacy program (in years and/or months)? Volunteers: $\bar{x}$ = 12.0 mos. (n=90; 1NR)
Paid: $\bar{x}$ = 14.6 mos. (n=8) (see page 2A)
Overall: $\bar{x}$ = 12.2 mos. (n=98; 1NR)

C. What is the total number of adult learners (including present learners) that you have tutored in this library literacy program over this period of time? Volunteer tutors: x = 2.0 learners (n=90; 1NR)
Paid tutors: x = 17.7 learners (n=8) (see page 2A)

D. What is the total number of hours you have tutored adult learners in this library literacy program over this period of time? See page 2A
Volunteer tutors: x = 100.0 hours (n=76; 15 NR)
Paid tutors: x = 276.4 hours (n=8)

E. Have you tutored these adult learners [Check more than one if applicable]:

1. 99 Individually (one-to-one)
2. 13 In small groups (two-to-six learners) [5 paid]
3. 3 In classroom settings (more than six learners) [2 paid]

F. How many adult learners are you presently tutoring? No response (NR) = 4

1. 17 None
2. 61 One
3. 9 Two
4. 2 Three
5. 1 Four
6. 5 More than four (number _____)

G. Are you tutoring these learners [Check more than one if applicable]:

1. 82 In individual, one-to-one instructional sessions
2. 11 In small groups (two-to-six learners) [3 paid]
3. 1 In a classroom setting (more than six learners)

H. Are you a volunteer tutor or are you paid to tutor?

1. 91 Volunteer [Go to I.]
2. 8 Paid - If paid, are you:
   a. 0 A student in a work-study program
   b. 7 A member of the library or literacy program staff
   c. 1 Other (please specify: _____)

I. In addition to tutoring, do you or have you ever been involved in any other organizational activities with this library literacy project? NR=2

1. No 77 [If "no", go to Section III]
2. Yes 20

   a. 11 Do/did clerical work
   b. 14 Help/helped with publicity efforts
   c. 6 Serve/served on advisory committee of the literacy program
   d. 4 Serve/served on community literacy coalition
   e. 6 Other - please describe:
   Tutor training - 4; worked with another literacy program -2

++

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

B. Months as a tutor with this literacy organization

	Volunteer tutors	Paid tutors
Less than 1 month	2	0
1 - 3 mos.	6	0
4 - 6 mos.	13	2
7 - 12 mos.	38	1
13 - 18 mos.	15	3
19 - 24 mos.	11	1
25 - 30 mos.	6	1
Total	91	8

C. Total number of adult learners tutored in this literacy program

	Volunteer Tutors	Paid Tutors
One	48	0
Two	25	0
Three	6	0
Four	3	1
Five	1	0
Six	3	0
Seven	3	1
Ten to thirty-two	1	6
Total	90	8
No response	1	

D. Total number of hours tutored adult learners in this literacy program

	Volunteer Tutors	Paid Tutors
1 - 20 hrs.	7	0
21 - 40 hrs.	17	0
41 - 60 hrs.	14	1
61 - 100 hrs.	14	0
101 - 199 hrs.	14	1
200 - 299 hrs.	5	3
Over 300 hrs.	5	3
Total	76	8
No response	15	

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Section III: Introduction to Program and Your Training for Being a Tutor

In this section, we want to know how you heard about the program, what kind of training you have received, and what you thought about the training. If you have received training but have not yet tutored, answer the first three questions (the ones with an asterisk) and then go to Section IV.

A.* How did you first hear about this library literacy project? [If you give more than one response, indicate with an asterisk (*) the source of information which resulted in your taking the tutor training workshop.]

1. 23 Television
2. 9 Radio
3. 29 Newspaper
4. 17 Posters/flyers
5. 32 Library
6. 2 School
7. 3 Church
8. 2 Family member
9. 14 Friend
10. 4 Other (please specify)
County air booth - 2
Professional women's group - 2
Another literacy program - 1

B.* How many hours was (were) your first tutor training workshop(s)? x = 9.5 hours (n=99) - also see page 3A

C.* Overall, how would you rate your initial tutor training workshop(s)?

1. 39 Excellent
2. 41 Very good
3. 15 Good
4. 1 Not very good
5. 0 Poor

NR = 3

D. Based on your experience as a tutor, what were some of most helpful things you learned and/or did during your initial tutor training workshop(s)?
Learning to teach (methods/techniques/etc.) - 59
Learning about sensitivity/psychology of the adult learner - 40
Learning to use Laubach Way to Reading series - 25
Learning about library/other resources - 8

E. Based on your experience as a tutor, was there additional information which might have been covered, were there additional materials which might have been presented, and/or were there additional activities which might have been engaged in to better prepare you for being a tutor?

1. No 69 [Go to F.] NR = 1 (see page 3A)
2. Yes 29

a. Additional information: 21

b. Additional materials: 13

c. Additional activities: 18

B. Hours of first tutor training workshop

No training - 10
2 - 5 hours - 14
6 - 10 hours - 28
11 - 15 hours - 42
16 - 20 hours - 3
More than 30 hours (?) - 2

E.2. Additional information/materials/activities which might have been engaged in to better prepare you for being a tutor

a. Additional information

3 - information from adult learners themselves
3 - selecting materials (other than those covered in workshop)
3 - more about adult learners
2 - information on spelling problems and how to teach spelling
2 - how to teach adults with learning disabilities
2 - developing advanced lessons (after learner has "completed" the course)
1 - teaching vowel sounds
1 - establishing rapport with the adult learner
1 - how to begin
1 - how to use work books
1 -"how to assess effect of physical defect"
1 - vocabulary building

b. Additional materials

2 - for new learners
2 - other than Laubach
1 -"how to assess effect of physical defect"
1 -"colors to focus attention"
1 - community references
1 - for advanced learners
1 - short, informal tests
1 -"what to use"
1 - pronounciation for ESL learners
1 - comprehension
1 - books

c. Additional activities

6 - greater variety of teaching techniques
3 - role playing
2 - spelling games
2 - advanced learning
1 - comprehension
1 - oral skills for ESL learners
1 - for working with adults with learning disabilities
1 - with other tutors
1 -"to assess effect of physical defects"

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

F. Was your knowledge of how to teach reading evaluated prior to your beginning work with your first adult learner?

1. Yes 48 How? n = 34 (see page 4A)

2. No 51 Do you think it would have been helpful to be evaluated prior to beginning work with your first adult learner?

a. Yes 18 Why? (see page 4A)

b. No 42 Why not? (see page 4A)

G. Were you matched up with your first adult learner: NR = 4

1. 4 Prior to pre-service training (your initial training workshop)
2. 19 During pre-service training
3. 45 Within two weeks of completing pre-service training
4. 13 Between two and four weeks following pre-service training
5. 14 More than four weeks following pre-service training (number of weeks ____)

H. Since your initial tutor training workshop(s), have you attended any tutor inservice training sessions?

	Number of sessions	Number of tutors
	NR	2
1. No 45 [Go to Section IV.]	1 - 2	28
	3 - 4	12
2. Yes 54	5 - 6	5
	> 8	7

a. How many inservice training sessions have you attended? $\bar{x}$ = 3.5

b. What topics were covered in those sessions?
Teaching techniques - 27 Teaching materials - 8
Tutor "rap" sessions - 19 "Real world" reading materials - 4
Learning process/language problems - 14 English as a second language - 4
Learner sensitivity issues - 9 Phonics - 4 Computers - 4 Writing - 2

c. Overall, how would you rate the inservice training sessions you have attended?

1) 21 Very helpful
2) 27 Helpful
3) 3 Not very helpful
4) 1 Not helpful at all
5) 5 Other - please explain: Could not judge

d. What could have made the inservice training sessions more helpful to you?
n = 21 (see page 4A)

++

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

F.1. How knowledge of how to teach reading was evaluated prior to beginning work with first adult learner

7 - oral or written test
6 - observation by tutor trainer during training
5 - prior professional experience
2 - role playing
1 - interview
1 - tutor evaluating tutor
1 - presentation before other tutor trainees
11 - knowledge assumed from having participated in training/evaluation part of training

34 Total (NR = 14)

F.2.a. Why evaluation would have been helpful (for tutors who weren't evaluated)

5 - to determine if I was qualified to teach
2 - to assess strengths and needs as a tutor
1 - to boost confidence level

F.2.b. Why evaluation would not have been helpful (for tutors who weren't evaluated)

10 - previous teaching experience
8 - each adult learner is unique
3 - method seems simple/manuals are good
2 - might have been intimidating
2 - training adequate
2 - learn best by doing
1 - would be better after some tutoring
4 - other

H.2.d. What could have made inservice training sessions more helpful

4 - involvement of tutor trainer
3 - information on working with learners with learning disabilities
2 - more information of different teaching methods
1 - more inservice training opportunities
1 - more handouts
1 - more "mature approach"
1 - more individualized attention
1 - more computer hours
1 - observation of "real" tutoring session
1 - questions and answers about learner progress
1 - less repetition

2 - no suggestions
2 - no response

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Section IV: Your Feelings About Your Overall Experience as a Tutor

In this section, we want to know why you decided to become a tutor and, if you have tutored, how the tutoring experience has affected you. If you have not yet tutored, please answer the first two questions (the ones with an asterisk) and then go to Section VIII.

A.* Why did you decide to become a tutor? 136 reasons (see page 5A)

B.* What were your personal expectations for the tutoring experience when you began your initial training? [IF NOT YET TUTORING: What are your personal expectations for the tutoring experience?]

97 expectations (see page 5A)

1. To what extent have those expectations been met?

92 responses (see page 5A)

2. To what extent have those expectations not been met?

32 responses (see page 5A)

3. To what extent have they changed? 25 responses (see page 5A)

C. What is the most important and significant way that being a tutor has affected your life? [Be as specific as you can.]

96 ways (see page 5A)

D. What is the greatest satisfaction you have gotten out of your work as a tutor? [Be as specific as you can.]

90 responses (see page 5A)

E. What has been the biggest frustration or greatest disappointment you have experienced in your work as a tutor? [Be as specific as you can.]

87 responses (see page 5A)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Reason(s) for becoming a tutor:

36 - I wanted to help others (26.5%)
35 - I wanted to teach (25.7%)
24 - I was concered about illiteracy in our community (17.6%)
14 - I love to read (10.3%)
13 - I wanted something to do (i.e., retired) (9.6%)
8 - for enjoyment/self-satisfaction (5.9%)
4 - I wanted volunteer experience (2.9%)
2 - as part of a group project (friends/church group) (1.5%)

136 - total number of responses

B. Expectations for tutoring experience prior to initial tutor training

50 - I would be teaching people to read (51.5%)
15 - I enjoy/would enjoy teaching (15.5%
11 - I would be helpful to others (11.3%)
6 - It would be a personal challenge (6.2%)
4 - I would have a motivated learner (4.1%)
3 - I would be able to improve the learner's emotional well-being (3.1%)
3 - I would improve my teaching skills (3.1%)
5 - Other (would make friends/would get a higher-level learner/would get a learner who spoke English/a scared learner/would get a full-time job) (5.2%)

97 - total number of responses

B.1. To what extent have those expectations been met?

26 - learner improving (28.3%)
26 - completely (28.3%)
20 - to a great extent (21.7%)
13 - somewhat (14.1%)
5 - not at all (5.4%)
2 -learner not improving (2.8%)

92 - total number of responses

B.2. To what extent have those expectations not been met?

23 - learner not improving (71.9%)
4 - learner motivated and/or progressing (12.5%)
2 - learner has too many needs (6.3%)
3 - other (extra lessons and preparation time/learner non-English speaking/had to wait for learner to be assigned to me) (9.4%)

32 - total number of responses

B.3. To what extent have those expectations changed?

15 - learner's progress will be slow (60%)
7 - tutoring is difficult/requires variety of teaching techniques (28%)
3 - other (I wasn't right for the job/I now know the learner is motivated/I need to set higher goals for the learner) (12%)

25 - total number of responses

C. Most important and significant way that being a tutor has affected your life?

39 - satisfaction from knowing I have helped others (40.6%)
19 - feeling a sense of belonging/being useful/being productive (19.8%)
18 - expanded interest in illiteracy/literacy (18.8%)
8 - appreciation of my background and life/thinking about learner's needs as I go through my daily life (8.3%)
7 - satisfaction of teaching/seeing person learn (7.3%)
5 - friendship with learner (5.2%)

96 - number of total responses

D. Greatest satisfaction from your work as a tutor?

54 - seeing person learn (60%)
26 - sense of helping others (28.9%)
10 - friendship with learner (11.1%)

90 - number of total responses

E. Biggest frustration/greatest disappointment of tutoring experience?

26 - slow progress of learner (29.9%)
16 - learner attendence problems (18.4%)
15 - learner dropping out/leaving program (17.2%)
13 - learner not doing homework (14.9%)
4 - learner learning difficulties/problems (4.6%)
4 - teaching English as a second language (4.6%)
3 - scope of the illiteracy problem (3.4%)
3 - lack of materials and resources at library (3.4%)
3 - other (tutoring site at library lacks quiet and privacy/becoming ill and not being able to continue tutoring/poor tutoring that goes on in program) (3.4%)

87 - total number of responses

F. How much longer do you plan to work as a tutor? NR = 7

1. 56 Indefinately
2. 3 Number of years
3. 4 Number of months
4. 25 Do not know or not sure
5. 4 Other - please explain Moving/husband's job
6. ____ Not applicable - no longer tutor (please answer question below)

If you no longer tutor, do you plan to tutor again? _____ Yes _____ No

If "No", why not? _____

++

Section V: Your Tutoring Methods and Materials

In this section, we want you to tell us a bit about the methods and materials you use in helping adult learners to acquire and master basic skills. We know there are a lot of ways in which to teach people how to read and write. We want to know about the methods and materials that you use.

A. On the average, about how much time do [did] you spend preparing for each tutoring session? x = 52 minutes (n=99) (see page 6A)

B. Do [did] you generally assign "homework" for your adult learners? NR = 3

1. No 11 [Go to C.]
2. Yes 85 Please describe types of assignments: 171 types of assignments (see page 6A)

C. Do [did] you include any of the following ON A REGULAR BASIS in the tutoring of your adult learner(s)? [Check all that you do (did).]

1. 52 Dictionary skills
2. 33 Duet reading (neurological impress method)
3. 6 Field trips
4. 24 Frierian techniques (e.g., learner chooses books, critiques learning session afterward, etc.)
5. 39 Language experience approach
6. 16 Mathematics
7. 24 Problem-solving techniques
8. 85 Phonics
9. 53 Study skills
10. 70 Identifying needs and setting goals with learner
11. 63 Word patterns
12. 38 Tutor-developed strategies
13. 26 Other - please specify: See page 6A

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Time spent in preparing for each tutoring session

Number of Tutors	Time Spent
2	No response (2.0%)
14	Less than 30 minutes (14.1%)
36	Thirty minutes up to an hour (36.4%)
31	Hour up to an hour-and-a-half (31.3%)
7	Hour-and-a-half up to two hours (7.1%)
9	Two hours or more (9.1%)
99	Total number of tutors

B.2. Types of homework assignments

Number of Tutors	Type of Homework Assignment
51	Writing assignments (journals/spelling/sentences/etc.)(29.2%)
48	Assignments from workbooks (28.1%)
34	Reading assignments (independent/from lessons) (19.9%)
12	Reading vocabulary words (7.0%)
7	Phonics work (4.1%)
5	Review work (2.9%)
4	Dictionary work (2.3%)
3	Current events work (1.8%)
3	Arithmetic/mathematics (1.8%)
3	Other (1.8%)
1	No response (0.1%)
171	- total number of responses

C.13. Other methods/techniques used on a regular basis in tutoring of adult learners

Number of Tutors Using	Method/techniques/etc.
5	Audio/visual materials (audio/video cassettes, etc.)
4	Writing assignments
4	Vocabulary development
3	Reading practice
3	Activities based on learner's interests
2	Job-related reading/writing activities
2	English conversation
4	Other
26	Total other methods/techniques named by tutors

D. Which of the following materials do [did] you use ON A REGULAR BASIS?

(20.3%)	1.	76	Laubach Way to Reading Skills Books and other materials: Laubach Way to Reading (72); More Stories (3); Other (1)
(5.6%)	2.	21	Literacy Volunteers of America books and materials
(1.3%)	3.	5	Challenger series
(5.6%)	4.	21	Other reading curricular materials
(2.7%)	5.	10	Materials for non-English speakers: Laubach Way to English (2)
(4.0%)	6.	15	Reference books: Dictionary (5)
(0.8%)	7.	3	Computer software: Word processing and spelling programs
(14.7%)	8.	55	Newspapers/magazines
(17.3%)	9.	65	Student interest-related materials
(9.3%)	10.	35	Other non-text reading materials
(2.1%)	11.	8	Audio cassettes and/or tapes
(1.1%)	12.	4	Videotapes, films, and/or movies
(15.2%)	13.	57	Other 11 - spelling/writing/grammar workbooks 9 - reading comprehension books 7 - functional reading (i.e., driver's manual, menues, grocery ads, deposit slips, etc.) 5 each - flashcards/library books/phonics workbooks 4 each - religious books/vocab. wkbks/crossword puzzles 3 - tutor-made games and materials

375 Total number of responses from tutors

++

VI. Nature of Your Tutoring Experience with Adult Learner

In this section, we want to know some specifics about your work with the adult learner identified in Section I. Answer these questions to the best of your ability, but we ask that you not consult with the adult learner when answering the questions. We want to know what you know and remember about your tutoring experience with this particular adult learner, regardless of whether the experience is (was) a new one or an old one, a long one or a short one, or a good one or a bad one.

A. When did you begin tutoring the adult learner identified in Section I?

W/i past 3 mos. - 17 4 to 6 mos. ago - 19 7 to 9 mos. ago - 26
10 to 12 mos. ago - 13 More than a year ago - 22 ($\bar{x}$ = 9 mos. ago)
(NR = 2; no difference between paid and volunteer - see page 7A)

B. How many hours have you tutored this adult learner? (see page 7A)
Paid: $\bar{x}$ = 68.8 hrs. (n=8) Volunteer: $\bar{x}$ = 60.6 (n=83; NR=8)
Overall: $\bar{x}$ = 61.3 hrs. (n=91; NR=8)

C. Do you tutor this adult learner:

1. 94 Individually (one-to-one)
2. 6 In a small group (two-to-six learners)
3. 2 In a classroom setting (more than six learners)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Began working with adult learner identified in Section I (NR = 2 volunteer tutors)

Number of tutors (n=97) Pd.	Vol.	Number of months ago
0	2	Less than one month
0	6	One month ago
0	5	Two months ago
0	5	Three months ago
0	17	= 17 within last three months (17.2%)
1	5	Four months ago
0	2	Five months ago
0	11	Six months ago
1	18	= 19 in past four-to-six months (19.2%)
2	13	Seven months
0	7	Eight months ago
1	3	Nine months ago
3	23	= 26 in past seven-to-nine months (26.3%)
2	2	Ten months ago
0	3	Eleven months ago
1	5	Twelve months ago
3	10	= 13 in past ten-to-twelve months (13.1%)
0	2	Thirteen months ago
1	6	Fourteen months ago
0	1	Fifteen months ago
0	3	Sixteen months ago
1	12	= 13 in past thirteen-to-eighteen months ago (13.1%)
0	7	= 7 in past nineteen-to-twenty-four months ago (7.2%)
0	2	= 2 more than twenty-four months ago (2.0%)

Mean number of months working with this learner	Paid	Volunteer
	9.1	9.1

B. Total hours tutored this adult learner (NR = 8 volunteer tutors)

Number of tutors (n=91) Pd.	Vol.	Total number of hours tutored this adult learner
0	7	Less than 10 hours (more more than none)
0	11	10 to 20 hours
1	12	21 to 30 hours
2	7	31 to 40 hours
1	10	41 to 50 hours
4	36	More than 50 hours
—	—	
8		Paid tutors tutored these learners total of 550 hours
	83.00	Volunteer tutors tutored these learners total of 5,026 hours

	Paid	Volunteer	Overall
Mean number of hours tutored these learners	68.8	60.6	61.3

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

D. Had anyone tutored this adult learner before you? NR = 5

1. No 59 [Go to E.]
2. Yes 39

a. With what results? See page 8A

b. How do you know? See page 8A

E. Did anyone interview this learner before you first met with him/her?

1. No 20 [Go to F.] NR = 10
2. Yes 69 Who (name and/or position) See page 8A

F. Did anyone check out this adult learner's reading and writing capabilities before you started tutoring with him/her?

1. No 28 [Go to G.] NR = 10
2. Yes 61

a. Who checked out his/her capabilities? See page 8A (n=54)

b. How were those capabilities checked? See page 8A (n=42)

c. What were the results? See page 8A (n=37)

d. Were you involved in the checking? 1) 10 Yes 2) 50 No

G. Do you happen to know what this adult learner's reading level was when s/he started tutoring with you?

1. No 51 [Go to H.] NR = 3
2. Yes 45 a. What was it (by grade level)? x = 2.1 (n=45)

b. How do you know? (Who told you?) See page 8A (n=42)

H. When this adult learner began working with you, what was it that s/he hoped to gain from the experience? NR = 6 How do you know?

168 responses for 93 learners (see page 8A)

I. Was there something in particular the learner wanted to learn to read and/or write? NR = 5

1. No 40 [Go to J.]
2. Yes 54 What? 64 responses for 54 learners (see page 8A):
   1. Read/write work-/job-related materials - 24 (37.5%)
   2. Read Bible - 10 (15.5%) 3. Read paper - 8 (12.5%)
   4. Read to kids - 7 (10.9%) 5. Read fiction - 6 (9.4%)
   6. Write checks - 5 (7.8%) 7. Read English - 4 (6.3%)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

D.2.a. Results of adult learner's previous tutoring (n=37; 2 NR)

Number of learners	Results of previous tutoring of these learners
13	No progress/minimal progress/poor progress/said to be "too dumb"/said to be "too slow"
8	OK/fair/alright
3	Good
7	Not sure/uncertain/don't know/learner had not pursued tutoring for significant period of time
1	Literate in Spanish
5	Uninterpretable response
37	Total number of learners for whom tutors made response

D.2.b. Source of information on the above results (n=28; 9 NR)

Told by adult learner - 13
Told by previous tutor/teacher - 5
Told by program director/coordinator - 3
Based on skill demonstrated by adult learner - 3
Information on learner's application/in learner's file - 2
Told by tutor trainer - 1
Do not know/do not remember - 1

E.2. Who interviewed adult learner before you met with him/her?

Number of learners	Person conducting interview
43	Program director/coordinator/supervisor
5	Program assistant/secretary
8	Someone else in program
1	Tutor
6	Member of library staff
4	Name (no identifying position)
2	Don't know/don't remember
69	Total number of learners responded on by tutors

F.2.a. Who checked learner's capabilities prior to tutoring?

Number of learners	Persons checking capabilities
28	Program director/coordinator/supervisor
5	Program assistant/secretary
9	Someone else in program
2	Tutor
2	Member of library staff
5	Name (no identifying position)
3	Don't know/don't remember
54	Total number of learners responded on by tutors (7 NR)

F.2.b. How were capabilities checked?

Number of learners	How capabilities were checked
19	Testing
8	Interview
5	Reading inventory
2	Reading Laubach materials
2	Slosson Oral Reading Test
1	By learner's wife
5	Unsure/uncertain
42	Total number of learners responded on by tutors (19 NR)

F.2.c. Results of check?

Number of learners	Results of check
8	"Almost" a non-reader
1	1st grade reading level
4	2nd grade reading level
5	2nd-to-3rd grade reading level
2	3rd grade reading level
2	3rd-to-4th grade reading level
1	4th-to-5th grade reading level
1	5th grade reading level
1	5th-to-6th grade reading level
1	Spoke no English
4	Don't know
7	Vague response
37	Total number of learners reported on by tutors (24 NR)

G.2.a. Reading level at time tutoring started

Number of learners	Reading level
13	Below 1st grade level
6	1st grade level
14	2nd grade level
4	3rd grade level
3	4th grade level
3	5th grade level
1	8th grade level
1	9th grade level
45	Total number of learners reported on by tutors

G.2.b. Source of information on learner's reading grade level

Number of learners	Source of information
15	Program director/coordinator/supervisor
1	Program assistant/secretary
7	Someone else in program
9	Tutor
1	Member of library staff
1	Name (no identifying information)
8	Adult learner
42	Total number of learners reported on by tutors (3 NR)

H. What adult learner hoped to gain from tutoring experience at time began working with this tutor

	Number of learners	What adult learner hoped to gain from experience
1.	34	Improved reading skills (19.7%)
2.	12	Improved writing skills (6.9%)
3.	10	Improved spelling skills (5.8%)
4.	1	Read/write letters (0.6%)
5.	4	Read novels/fiction/for pleasure (2.3%)
6.	5	Read the newspaper (2.9%)
7.	6	Read Bible (3.5%)
8.	-	Read cookbooks
9.	7	Read to children/grandchildren/help with homework (4.0%)
10.	5	To do better on the job/improve job performance (2.9%)
11.	1	To get a job promotion (0.6%)
12.	22	To get a job/to get a better job (12.7%)
13.	9	Emotional satisfaction (improve self-confidence/feel better about self/etc.) (5.2%)
14.	10	Educational advancement (prepare for school/go to night school/go to college/get GED/get college diploma/further education/etc.) (5.8%)
15.	4	Gain greater awareness of current events and what is going on in the world (2.3%)
16.	2	Get around better (by being able to read street signs/etc.) (1.2%)
17.	-	Be able to use government services or get government benefits
18.	11	Read/write/speak/understand English (6.4%)
19.	30	Other - Take driver's test/get license - 8 (4.6%) - Learn phonics/learn to sound out words/improve pronounciation - 4 (2.3%) - Read for information/directions - 3 (1.7%) - Increased freedom/independence - 2 (1.2%) - Write checks - 2 (1.2%) - Help out at school/church - 2 (1.2%) - Regain lost skills - 1 (0.6%) - Make out grocery list - 1 (0.6%)

H. What learner hoped to get from experience (continued)

19.	Other (cont.)	- "Missing out" - 1 (0.6%) - Increased understanding - 1 (0.6%) - Gain spousal approval - 1 (0.6%) - Write notes - 1 (0.6%) - Become an American citizen - 1 (0.6%) - Get off welfare - 1 (0.6%) - Learn about family history - 1 (0.6%)
173		Total number of different types of responses given by tutors as to what these 93 adult learners hoped to get out of the tutoring experience

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

J. When you started working with this learner, could s/he:

	(1) Yes - with little or no problem	(2) Somewhat - a little bit, not completely, but enough to use information	(3) No - not at all, not enough to really understand	Don't know, don't remember
1. Read the newspaper?	7	30	57	3
2. Read his/her bills?	25	31	24	14
3 Read street signs?	28	43	20	5
4. Read cooking directions on food products?	15	24	33	19
5. Read the menues at McDonald's?	22	18	29	24
6. Read notices from work?	15	23	36	18
7. Read notes from his/her child's school?	14	18	32	26

1. $\bar{x}$ = 2.48 2. $\bar{x}$ = 1.87 3. $\bar{x}$ = 1.85 4. $\bar{x}$ = 2.02 5. $\bar{x}$ = 1.93
6. $\bar{x}$ = 2.09 7. $\bar{x}$ = 2.00 (Means only for those skills levels reported in columns 1, 2, and 3, which correspond to point values assigned to each response.)

K. How long did it take you to establish the rapport necessary for this adult learner to begin making progress in reading? Insufficient information

L. Did the learner have any say in deciding where and when to meet with you for tutoring?

1. No 19 [Go to M.]
2. Yes 80 Are you meeting where and when s/he wanted to?
   a. 71 Yes b. 3 No c. 6 No response

M. How often do [did] you meet with this adult learner for tutoring?

1. 35 Once a week
2. 59 Twice a week
3. 4 Three times a week
4. 1 More than three times a week

N. Would you prefer [have preferred] to meet:

1. 23 More often than you do? How often? _____ times per week more
2. 1 Less often than you do? How much? _____ times per week less
3. 72 The same number of times as we do now [did when we were meeting]

O. Where do [did] you meet with this adult learner?

1. 62 Library
2. 12 Your home
3. 12 Tutor's home
4. 3 School
5. 1 Business place
6. 3 Church
7. 0 Jail/prison
8. 6 Other (specify) _____

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

P. Would you rather meet [have met] at another place?

1. No 91 [Go to Q.]
2. Yes 8 Where? 2 wanted quieter, more private spot than library

Q. How would you rate the books and other materials that you are using [used] with this adult learner?

1. 42 Excellent
2. 40 Very good
3. 13 Good
4. 1 Not very good
5. 0 Poor
6. 21 Other/additional comments:

See page 10A

R. What kinds of books, materials or learning activities might be [have been] more helpful to this adult learner for learning to read and write?

43 responses (see page 10A)

S. Does [did] this adult learner spend time studying on his/her own? NR = 5

1. No 19 [Go to T.]
2. Yes 75 How many hours per week does s/he study on his/her own? ____
   $\bar{x}$ = 3.6 hrs. (n=28; 47 NR) (see page 10A)

T. Do you know who are the significant people in this adult learner's life? Do they know that s/he is involved in the literacy program? If they do, are they providing him/her with assistance and support in his/her efforts to better him/herself? What kind of assistance and support are they providing? [If you know some, but not all of this information, fill in what you know. If you don't know, please go to Section VII.]

	Name or Relationship of Significant Others	Know of Program Involvement Yes	No	Provide Support Yes	No	What Kind?
1.	See page 10A - 84 tutors responding on their adult learners, listing 149 relationships, with 127 noted as to support/non-support					
2.						
3.						

Q.6. Other/additional comments with respect to rating of books and other materials using/use with this adult learner

Laubach materials too elementary/dull - 4
More materials needed for practical/survival reading - 3
More materials needed with adult themes - 3
Need more appropriate/structured materials - 2
Need spelling supplement with each book - 1
Need more time to use materials - 1
Need more materials for teaching English as a second language - 1
Need more materials for higher reading levels - 1
Reading books excellent/workbooks not satisfactory - 1
Can't judge/haven't seen other materials - 1
Other - 3

R. Kinds of books, materials, or learning activities that might be [have been] more helpful to this adult learner for learning to read and write

More mature/high interest material for lower reading levels - 16
More materials for teaching "survival" skills (bank forms, job applications, etc.) - 4
More writing books, materials, and activities - 3
Spelling books for adults - 3
Newspapers - 2
Audio-/video-tapes - 2
English conversation materials - 2
Pre-printed flashcards - 1
Ideas for short-term goals - 1
Reading comprehension materials - 1
Closer access to materials - 1
Techniques for "remediating reversals" - 1
Other - 6

S. Time adult learner spends studying on his/her own

Number of learners	Hours spent studying on own
7	1 hour/week
4	2 hours/week
4	3 hours/week
3	4 hours/week
5	5 hours/week
3	6 hours/week
1	8 hours/week
1	10 hours/week
47	No response

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

T. Significant people in learner's life/support given

Significant others	None	Moral support	Help with homework/ reading/ writing/ etc.	Provide childcare/ transpo/ housesit/ etc.	Also in program	Unsure	NR
Spouse (50)	3	26	14	3	2	1	5
Children (30)	-	11	13	-	-	-	7
Parents (16)	2	6	2	2	-	2	3
Siblings (10)	-	7	1	-	2	-	-
Friends (20)	-	14	5	-	-	-	3
In-laws (4)	-	3	1	-	1	-	1
Aunt/uncle (3)	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Nephew/niece (1)	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Grandparent (1)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Grandchildren (2)	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Coworkers (1)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Boss (5)	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Pastor (2)	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Church sec'y (1)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ex-spouse (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Therapist (1)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Program Coordinator (1)	Asked learner to appear on radio and television spots						
149 significant others for 84 adult learners	6	80	37	5	5	3	22

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Section VII: Impact of Your Tutoring on Adult Learner

In this section, we want to know what impact you think that your tutoring has had (or had) upon the adult learner identified in Section I. Again, as in Section VI, we want to know your perceptions as to how the tutoring experience has affected (or affected) this particular adult learner, so, please, do not consult with the adult learner in answering this section.

A. When you started working with the adult learner identified in Section I (and discussed in Section VI), did the two of you set a goal that s/he wanted to reach, that is, did the two of you decide on something specific that the learner wanted to learn or achieve?

1. No 25 [Go to B.] NR = 6
2. Yes 68

   a. What is [was] the goal? See page 11A (NR = 5)

   b. Has the learner reached [Did the learner reach] the goal?

      1) No 49 What kind of progress is the learner making [did the learner make] toward reaching the goal?

         63 learner goals listed; progress reported on 40 goals (see page 11A)

      2) Yes 17 Did the two of you set a new goal?

         a) No 1 [Go to B.] NR = 4
         b) Yes 12 What is [was] it? 11 listed with new goal; NR = 1 (see page 11A)

B. Has the learner had his/her reading capabilities checked out since s/he started in the literacy program?

1. No 64 [Go to C.] NR = 2
2. Yes 33

   a. When was the last time they were checked? See page 11A (NR = 1)

   b. Who checked them? See page 11A (n=32; 1 NR)

   c. How were they checked? See page 11A (n=32; 1 NR)

   d. What were the results? See page 11A (n=29; 4 NR)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A.2.a. Progress on goals not achieved (by goal set)

Secure HS diploma/GED (2)
- taking home work from school (1)
- good progress (1)

Read/write/spell better (20)
- progressing toward goal (5)
- improvement/needs confidence (1)
- reads with interest (1)
- using dictionary for new words (1)
- great progress (1)
- up to Skills Book 3 (1)
- finished Laubach series (1)
- slow (1)
- thinking more for self (1)
- compares study notes with daughter who is in 3rd grade (1)
- NR (6)

Get new job/enter new field (13)
- good/great progress (3)
- understands what he reads (1)
- reading and self-confidence significantly improved (1)
- very slow (1)
- not enough improvement to read work manuals yet (1)
- NR (6)

Read bks./newspaper/Bible (13)
- has read simple book (3)
- learning new words/sounding out words (1)
- difficulty with larger words (1)
- reads simple Bible verse (1)
- NR (7)

Prep for/go to college (2)
- good progress (1)
- English needs polishing (1)

Write notes/letters/stories (2)
- doing well, but new job made continuing tutoring impossible (1)
- good (1)

Get driver's license (6)
- ready, but can't afford it (1)
- slow, better at reading and interpreting signs (1)
- good (1)
- NR (3)

Speak English better (4)
- improved skills (2)
- good, but needs more practice (1)
- NR (1)

Pass citizenship test (1)
- very good (1)

[63 goals; progress note on 40]

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A.2.b.2)b)

Goals achieved	New goal set
- Got a job	- Write personal letters
- Became a U.S. citizen	- Learn math/read aloud in church
- Improved reading and writing	- Continue to improve in reading and writing
- Improved reading and writing	- Continue to improve in reading and writing
- Completed Skill Book 1	- Improve phonics and word attack skills
- Can read paragraph with ease	- Read aloud in church
- Learned ABC's	- Read newspaper and labels
- Learned to write	- Learn to print
- Improved conversational skills	- Continue to work on conversational skills
- Improved reading, signs name	- Improve reading rate
- Completed books	- Enter college program

B.2.a. Last time reading capabilities checked

Number of learners	Reading capabilities checked
17	Within past three months
7	Within past four to six months
2	Within past seven to nine months
2	Within past ten to twelve months
1	Within past twelve to eighteen months
1	Within past nineteen to twenty-four months
1	Within past twenty-five to thirty months
2	NR
33	

B.2.b. Who checked reading capabilities

Number of learners	Reading capabilities checked by
22	Tutor
4	Program director/coordinator/supervisor
2	School/college
4	Other
32	

B.2.c. How were reading capabilities checked

Number of learners	Reading capabilities checked by
11	Skill book checkups
5	Unspecified test
4	Reading test
2	Oral reading
2	Spelling test
2	Project test book
1	Oral test
1	Public school criteria
1	Observation of tutoring session
1	Don't know
2	Response made no sense
32	

B.2.d. Results of check

Number of learners	Results of check
8	Excellent/very good/good/well
4	Progress/improvement
3	90%/few errors
4	Mastery/passed/got certificate
6	Increased reading grade level
2	Satisfactory
1	Needs review
1	Only knows letters
29	

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

C. Do you happen to know the present reading level of this adult learner?

1. No 71 [Go to D.] 2 NR
2. Yes 26 a. What is it (grade level) $\bar{x}$ = 3.6 (n=26)

b. How do you know? See page 12A (n=26)

D. Earlier, you were asked the extent to which this adult learner could read certain things before s/he began tutoring with you. As of today (or when you stopped tutoring the learner), can (could) this learner:

See page 12A for comparison of pre-/post-means for these functional skills	(1) Yes - with little or no problem	(2) Somewhat - a little bit, not completely, but enough to use information	(3) No - not at all, not enough to really understand	Don't know, haven't checked it out
1. Read the newspaper?	22	46	18	5
2. Read your bills?	45	27	6	14
3. Read street signs?	60	26	4	3
4. Read cooking directions on food products?	40	20	8	17
5. Read the menus at McDonald's?	50	19	7	13
6. Read notices from work?	37	22	10	15
7. Read notes from your child's school?	35	16	9	20

E. Earlier in this questionnaire, you noted that when tutoring began with this learner, there were some things s/he was looking for, including some reasons for wanting tutoring and some things s/he wanted to learn. Have you been able to help this learner to realize these expectations? [If need be, go back and review your answers to Questions H. and I. in Section VI on page 8 before answering this question. There may well be a "yes" and a "no" response to this question.] NR = 6

1. Yes 78 How so? 67 responses on 67 adult learners (9 NR)
See page 12A
2. No 15 Why not? Responses on 13 adult learners (2 NR)
See page 12A

F. What can this adult learner read or write now that s/he couldn't read or write before coming into the literacy program? Be as specific as you can.

167 responses on 89 adult learners (10 NR)

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

C.2.a. Present reading level of adult learner

Number of learners	Reported current grade level
3	Less than first grade
1	First grade
5	Second grade
5	Third grade
4	Fourth grade
2	Fifth grade
2	Sixth grade
3	Seventh grade
1	Eighth grade
26	

C.2.b. Source of information on reported grade level

Number of Tutors	Source of information
11	Tutor approximation from observation/learner's reading
5	Skill book level/grade level of books used
4	Reading test
2	Project director/coordinator
1	Adult learner
3	NR
26	

D. Tutor assessment of learner's functional skills in 7 areas (means for responses in columns 1, 2, and 3 - before tutoring began and at present)

	Before tutoring	At present
1. Reading newspaper	2.48	1.79
2. Reading bills	1.87	1.71
3. Reading street signs	1.85	1.37
4. Reading directions on food package	2.02	1.71
5. Reading menu at McDonald's	1.93	1.61
6. Reading notices from work	2.09	1.70
7. Reading notes from child's school	2.00	1.73

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

E.1. Ways in which tutoring has helped learner to realize original expectations for program participation

Number of learners	Percentage of responses	Main category (followed by response examples)
16	21.1%	Improved self-confidence/self-esteem - "Helping her to develop her self-esteem" - "Higher self-esteem" - "Now reads more confidently" - "Helped her to realize how much she knows" - "Now willing to try challenging material" - "Not as defensive or defiant" - "Knows he can go all the way now" - "Proud to be able to write letters at Christmans" - "Elated at being able to read" - Increase in motivation to achieve/read/etc. (3)
28	36.8%	General basic skills improvements (improved reading/writing/spelling)
12	15.8%	Functional skills improvements (other than those related to job/work) - Can write checks/opened checking account - Reading children's books - "Can write simple letters to relatives" - Can read magazines and newspapers - Learned printing and handwriting - Reading cookbooks - "Gave reading in front of church [congregation]" - "Reads select books at home for enjoyment" - "Got driver's license" -"Understands more spoken English"
6	7.9%	Work-related improvements - Has a job - "Passed written test to qualify for new job" - "Got help on business reports" - "Entering partnership [to start own business]" - "Can read work schedule"
5	6.6%	Other - "Still doubts ability to compete in English class at night school" - "Has enrolled in community college and is doing well" - "Just by helping her" - "Progress slow due to personal problems" - "Passed written portion of naturalization exam"

E.2. Expectations that have not been met

- "The Bible is very difficult, but she can read simple books and flash cards."
- "[Learner] needs more time"
- "His reading abilities are only slightly improved"
- "[But] she is anxious to come to her lesson and goes to the library and studies on her own."
- "Time has been short, but [learner] has been showing some progress"
- "Student's work hours were very uncertain and finally we were not able to meet at all."
- "[Learner] has not reached level to enroll in college courses, only to conduct her business and speak on the phone"
- "Not completely, but fairly well"
- "Understands English better, but still cannot speak or comprehend as clearly or rapidly as [learner] desires"
- "Not enough time to study and [learner] appears to have a mental block"
- "He needs more tutoring and I had to quit."
- "Student's goals were unrealistic and he was unwilling to work to fill in the gaps in his reading."
- "The books seem too short for her. They aren't involving enough. [Learner] is frustrated by spelling problems."

F. What adult learner can read or write now that couldn't before

Read - 90 responses (55.9% of total number of responses) for 66 learners (92% of total number of learners on whom reported)

- 14 - books (not including children's books and skills books)
- 14 - newspapers and magazines
- 21 - alphabet/numbers/words
- 8 - street/traffic signs
- 1 - children's books
- 4 - work-related materials
- 4 - mail/letters/bills/flyers
- 7 - packages/instructions/forms
- 8 - Laubach skills books/stories
- 9 - other reading materials

Write - 60 responses (37.3% of total number of responses) for 29 learners (38% of total number of learners on whom reported)

- 8 - personal letters
- 11 - words/phrases/sentences
- 4 - job applications/forms
- 2 - work-related materials
- 11 - checks
- 5 - address/phone number/date
- 6 - notes/phone messages
- 8 - paragraphs/stories
- 4 - alphabet/capital and small letters
- 1 - "materials in daily life he previously ignored"

Other - 11 responses (6.8% of total number of responses) for 11 learners (14% of total number of learners on whom reported)

- 4 - little or nothing
- 3 - can sound words out
- 1 - math problems
- 1 - handle money
- 1 - help daughter with homework
- 1 - "always could read and write"

G. What would you say is the most significant way in which this adult learner's participation in the program has affected his/her life?

87 reports on 87 learners; see page 13A

H. Have you noticed any changes in the appearance, dress, posture, attitude, or self-confidence of this adult learner since s/he began participating in the literacy program? [IF YOU NO LONGER TUTOR THIS LEARNER: While this learner was in the literacy program, did you notice any changes in his/her appearance, dress, posture, attitude, or self-confidence?]

1. 23 No [Go to I.]
2. 70 Yes - What kind of changes? [Be as specific as you can.]

77 comments on 68 learners (2 NR); see page 13A

I. Have there been any changes in this adult learner's educational goals or plans since s/he began participating in the literacy program? [IF YOU NO LONGER TUTOR THIS LEARNER: Did his/her educational goals or plans change as a result of being in the literacy program?]

1. 44 No [Go to J.]
2. 32 Don't know [Go to J.]
3. 19 Yes - What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]

19 reports on 19 learners; see page 13A

J. Have there been any changes in this learner's job situation or career plans since s/he began participating in the literacy program? [IF YOU NO LONGER TUTOR THIS LEARNER: Did his/her job situation or career plans change as a result of being in the literacy program?]

1. 49 No [Go to K.]
2. 15 Don't know [Go to K.]
3. 28 Yes - What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]

27 comments on 27 learners (1 NR); see page 13A

K. Have there been any changes in the family life of this adult learner since s/he began participating in the literacy program? [IF YOU NO LONGER TUTOR THIS LEARNER: Were there any changes in his/her family life as a result of his/her being in the literacy program?]

1. 36 No [Go to L.]
2. 35 Don't know [Go to L.]
3. 24 Yes - What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]

28 comments on 23 learners (1 NR); see page 13A

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

G. Most significant way in which program has affected learner's life (reports on 87 learners)

Increased self-confidence/self-esteem	- 59 (67.8%)
- "More self-confident"	
- "A better sense of humor"	
- "Has overcome fear of failure"	
- "Trying new things"	
- "Has a 'can do' attitude now"	
- "Pleased with his improvement"	
Improved basic skills (reading/writing/spelling)	- 7 (8.0%)
Increased competence	- 5 (5.7%)
- "Off welfare and in an entrance-level position"	
- "Promoted in her job"	
- "Reaching out at her job learning new skills"	
Improved social life	- 4 (4.6%)
- "More friendly"	
- "Talks to others"	
- "Not so shy"	
- "Participating member in our Literacy Council and getting married"	
Improved family life	- 3 (3.4%)
- "Can share learning with his children"	
- "Able to read to blind mother"	
Improved self-direction	- 4 (4.6%)
- "Wants to get better job"	
- "Has more hope that his situation will change"	
- "Anticipation of greater opportunity"	
- "Hope for a meaningful life"	
Other (basically positive)	- 1 (1.1%)
- "Happier"	
Other (basically negative)	- 1 (1.1%)
- "None, wasn't in that long"	
Don't know/can't tell yet	- 3 (3.4%)
TOTALS	- 87 (99.7%)

H.2. Changes in learner's appearance, dress, posture, attitude or self-confidence (77 comments on 68 learners)

Changes in self-confidence	- 43 (55.8%)
Changes in attitude	- 26 (33.8%)

"More positive" (6)
"Happier"/"smiles more" (5)
"More eager/enthusiastic" (3)
"More assertive" (2)
"Proud"
"More friendly"
"More determined"
"Not defensive about reading anymore"
"No longer shy"

Changes in appearance	- 6 (7.8%)

"Wears better clothes"
"Walks straighter"
"More interested in appearance"
"Looks less tired"
"Dresses more neatly"

Other	- 2 (2.6%)

"Wants to help slow students"
"More participation at church"

TOTALS	- 77 (100.0%)

I.3. Changes in learner's educational goals (reports on 19 learners)

Plan to get GED/high school diploma	- 4 (21.1%)
Plan to study for particular occupational area	- 4 (21.1%)
Plan to expand learning	- 3 (15.8%)
Plan to go back to school	- 3 (15.8%)
College is a possibility/resolved to go to college	- 2 (10.5%)
Would like to be a tutor	- 1 (5.3%)
Plans to take more English	- 1 (5.3%)
Plans to better self at work	- 1 (5.3%)
TOTALS	19 (100.2%)

J.3. Changes in learner's job situation/career plans (reports on 27 learners)

Got a job/got a new job	- 10	(37.0%)
Present job improvements	- 7	(25.9%)
- Got a raise (2)		
- More confident/assertive (2)		
- Taking computer class at work		
- Studying for exam for higher level position		
- Applied for a new position		
Plan a career change	- 5	(18.5%)
Looking for a new job	- 3	(11.1%)
More willing to take job application tests	- 1	(3.7%)
No longer works outside of home (not as a result of program)	- 1	(3.7%)
TOTALS	- 27	(99.9%)

K.3. Changes in learner's family life

Family members proud/glad/encouraging	-	4
Positive improvement in relationships with children	-	5
- "Father and son work together on reading and writing"		
- Better rapport with children		
- More understanding of children's problems		
- More in charge of children		
- More assertive with children		
Has resulted in problems in family/home relationships	-	3
- Has separated from boyfriend		
- More quarrels with husband, demanding better grades from children		
- "There are family problems"		
Increased personal independence	-	3
- Planning to move out as soon as can find apartment		
- Living more on her own		
- Doing more on her own		
Improved relationships with spouse	-	3
- "More assertive at home as wife....less frightened		
- "More tolerant and understanding of wife's problems"		
- "Husband is beginning to take notice"		
Family members also enrolled in program	-	2

K.3. Changes in learner's family life (continued)

Other - 8

- Got a job which meant increase in family income
- "Planning a positive life style"
- Going out more
- "Bringing him out"
- Reads for pleasure
- "Dating women other than his girlfriend....relationships are improving....he is more considerate of others
- More communication in family
- Happier

L. Have there been any changes in the way this learner uses his/her free time since s/he began participating in the literacy program? [IF YOU NO LONGER TUTOR THIS LEARNER: Were there any changes in his/her use of free time as a result of his/her being in the literacy program?]

1. 13 No [Go to Section VIII]
2. 47 Don't know [Go to Section VIII]
3. 35 Yes - What changes have occurred? [What changes occurred?]

46 comments on 35 learners

++

Section VIII: Personal Information

You have finally reached the last section of your questionnaire. I just want to thank you a lot for all the time and thought you've given in your answers. In this section, we just want to find out some information on you, who you are, what you do, and so on. Please remember that the information is confidential. This means no one but yourself and the staff of Wurzbacher and Associates will ever see your questionnaire or the specific answers you gave to the questions. Your responses will be put together with the responses from the 99 other tutors filling out this questionnaire to give us the rich and varied picture of the tutors who, along with the adult learners, are the heart and soul of the California Literacy Campaign.

A. What is your sex? 1. Male 12 2. Female 87

B. How old are you?

1. 16-19 years 0 2. 20-29 years 9 3. 30-39 years 19
4. 40-49 years 18 5. 50-65 years 34 6. 65+ years 19

C. Are you married? 1. Yes 64 2. No 34

D. What is your race?

1. Caucasian 85 2. Asian 2 3. Hispanic 5 4. Black 4
5. Native American 1 6. Pacific Islander 0 7. Other 0

If "Other," please specify:

E. What language do you speak at home? (One tutor listed two)

1. 98 English 2. 1 Other - specify: Russian; Tagalog (?)

F. What country were you born in? 1. United States 91 2. Other 8

If "Other," please specify England (2); Canada (2); Russia (1); Phillipines (1); NR (2)

L.3.c. Changes in learner's use of leisure time

Reads/reads more (for self) - 20

- Books (6)
- Magazines (2)
- Newspapers
- Dictionary
- Short stories
- Notices
- Type of reading not specified (10)

Studying/doing homework - 10

Uses library - 4

Watches less television - 2

Other - 10

- Helps children with their homework
- Attends ABE classes
- Family has respect for her
- Listens more carefully to radio and television
- Practices speech at home
- Listens better
- Thinks better before he speaks
- Not afraid to write
- Participates more
- Keeps appointments

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

G. What was the last grade you completed in school? (NR = 1)

1. Up to 4th grade 0
2. 5th to 8th grade 0
3. 9th to 11th grade 2
4. 12th grade 13
   a. High school diploma 10
   b. G.E.D. 1
5. College (number of years) 83
   a. No degree 2
   b. Associate degree 0
   c. Bachelor's degree 36
   d. Master's degree 37
   e. Doctoral degree 8

H. Are you presently employed?

1. Yes 44

   a. Are you employed:

      1) 25 Full-time
      2) 2 Part-time but looking for full-time work
      3) 17 Part-time and not looking for full-time work

   b. What kind of work do you do (job title/brief description)? 1 NR

      Professional/managerial in large firm - 14
      Semi-professional/managerial in small firm - 12
      Clerical/sales - 11
      Skilled/semi-skilled - 5
      Agriculture/unskilled - 1

   c. What type of company or business do you work for? 1 NR

      Public sector (state or local gov't/state or local schools) - 28
      Private sector (major corporation) - 2
      Private sector (small business/local industry/etc.) - 9
      Self-employed - 5 (includes one person also in public sector)

   d. About how much do you make each week/month/year? $\bar{x}$ = $18,069/yr. (n=44)

2. No 21 Are you looking for work?

   a. No 17 [Go to J.]
   b. Yes 4 Have you applied for a job in the last month or so? a. Yes 4 b. No 0

I. Are you a homemaker? 1. No 22 2. Yes 54 3. NR 22

J. Are you retired? 1. No 52 10 NR
2. Yes 36 From what type of job/company:

Professional/managerial in large firm - 24
Semi-professional/managerial in small firm - 1
Clerical/sales - 5 Skilled/semi-skilled - 1 No response - 5

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

K. Are you a student? NR = 5

1. No 72
2. Yes 22 a. Full-time 4
   b. Part-time 16

L. Do you have a disability that prevents you from working either part-time or full-time? 1. No 82 NR = 5
2. Yes 12 Type Physical (2); visual impairment (2); arthritis (2); mental (1); mental and physical (1); work-related injury (1); NR = 3

M. 1. How many people live in your home? $\bar{x}$ = 2.2 (n=99)

2. For each person living in your home (other than yourself), please give me his/her age and relationship to you: NR = 22

	Number of children			
With children (n = 26)	1	2	3	4
With spouse	13	6	1*	1
With no spouse	5			

*Incl. 2 grandchildren

With no children (n = 51) - with spouse - 41
- with spouse/other relation - 1
- with father/mother - 2
- with father/mother/siblings - 1
- with mother - 1
- with other relations - 2
- with friends - 1
- with fiancee - 1
- by self - 1

N. Are you the primary wage-earner in your household?

1. Yes 51 Husband - 34; wife - 2; equal/both - 2; both retired - 4; mother (retired) - 1; parents - 1;
2. No 48 Who is? aunt - 1; investments - 1; no income - 2

O. Are you currently receiving any form of financial assistance from either the Federal or California government?

1. No 64 NR = 3
2. Yes 32 What type of assistance are you receiving?
   a. 20 Social security
   b. 3 Supplemental security income (SSI)
   c. 1 Welfare
   d. 1 Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)
   e. 7 Medical assistance (Medicaid/Medicare/Medical)
   f. 1 Veteran's benefits
   g. 3 Disability benefits
   h. 3 Rent supplement
   i. 0 Job training
   j. 0 Other _____

P. About how much money do the people in your household make over the course of a year?

1.	4	Less than $5,000
2.	3	$5,000 to $9,999
3.	4	$10,000 to $14,999
4.	5	$15,000 to $19,999
5.	22	$20,000 to $29,999
6.	31	$30,000 or higher
7.	30	No response

N. How much time each week do [did] you spend studying on your own?

$\bar{x}$ = 6.0 Number of hours each week

O. Overall, what do you think of the job your tutor [teacher] is doing [did] in helping you to learn? (Overall, how would you rate your tutor [teacher] on the job s/he is doing [did] in helping you to learn?)

1. 68 Excellent
2. 29 Very good
3. 4 Good
4. 3 Not very good
5. 0 Poor
6. _____ Other/additional response - specify: _____

P. Have you helped anyone else to get into the literacy [reading] program?

1. No 81 [Go to Q.]
2. Yes 23 How many have begun tutoring? Average of 1 learner each

Q. Have you helped spread the word about the program in other ways?

1. No 42 [Go to R.]
2. Yes 62 How? [You may have to read through this list.]
   - a. 1 Put up posters
   - b. 1 Attended meetings of adult learners
   - c. 2 Attended meetings of tutors and adult learners
   - d. 0 Been interviewed for TV or radio broadcast
   - e. 1 Been interviewed for newspaper article
   - f. 1 Served on a committee of the literacy [reading] program (which one: _____)
   - g. 1 Served on the community literacy coalition?
   - h. 1 Written, called, or visited public official about literacy needs of people like yourself?
   - i. 61 Other (specify: Talked to other people about the program _____

R. Did you have a library card before you started with the literacy program?

1. Yes 23 Do you use the library more now than you did before you started with the literacy program?
   - a. No 7 [Go to Section IV]
   - b. Yes 16 About how many times a month do you use the library? $\bar{x}$ = 3 times/month
2. No 81 Do you have a library card now?
   - a. No 46 [Go to Section IV]
   - b. Yes 35 About how many times a month do you use the library? $\bar{x}$ = 3 times/month

CALIFORNIA LITERACY CAMPAIGN
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW II

ADULT LEARNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section IV: Impact of the Literacy Program Experience

[Again, this is for all adult learners who are being tutored or have been tutored in the past in this literacy program. Questions are to be asked in relation to the adult learner's present tutor or the last tutor the adult learner had while active in the program.]

This is the third part of your interview. It is the most important part. In this part, we would like you to tell us if you are getting [got] the help you were looking for when you came into the program. We also want to know how your tutor [teacher] is helping [helped] you. We want to know if your reading and writing has improved. We also want to know if being in the program has affected [had any effect on] your life in any other ways. This information will tell us how well the literacy [reading] programs in California are working.

A. What do [did] you like best about your work with your tutor [teacher]? [There may be more than one response.]

1. 52 Skills taught (reading, writing, speaking English, etc.)
2. 49 Tutor's [teacher's] attitude, teaching style, etc.
3. 32 Methods used in teaching me how to read, write, speak, etc.
4. 21 Pace of learning, going at my pace or speed, not too fast, etc.
5. 30 The individual attention given me by my tutor [teacher]
6. 12 Feeling better about myself, about doing something for myself, about doing something I've needed to do for a long time, etc.
7. 1 Other - specify:

B. What do [did] you like least about your work with your tutor [teacher]? [There may be more than one response.]

1. 1 Lessons don't [didn't] apply to the "real world" (my job, home situation, etc.)
2. 1 Lessons don't [didn't] apply to my goals, the things I wanted to learn, etc.
3. 0 The work is [was] too easy, the pace is [was] too slow, etc.
4. 12 I want [wanted] to meet more often with my tutor [teacher]
5. 9 I want [wanted] to meet with my tutor [teacher] in a different place or at a different time
6. 71 Other - specify:

Nothing (54); homework (3); pace too fast (2); tutor left or is leaving (2); writing tasks (2); need childcare (1); tutor too strict (1); tutor doesn't speak Spanish (1); fitting in time for lessons (1); takes away from family life (1); out-of-touch [with tutor] (1); [learner] had to leave program (1); want to spend more time on reading and less on maps, spelling, and writing (1)

C. When you started working with your tutor, did the two of you set a goal that you wanted to reach, that is, did you decide on something specific you wanted to learn or achieve?

1. No 54 [Go to D.]
2. Yes 50

a. What is [was] it?

Secure HS diploma/GED	- 13
Read, write and/or spell better	- 10
Get to higher grade level in reading	- 8
Get better job/enter new job field	- 5
Read specific books or newspaper	- 4
Go to college	- 4
Write letters/notes/stories	- 4
Get driver's license	- 2
Other	- 8

b. Have you reached [did you reach] this goal? (Have you learned [did you learn] it?)

1) No 43 What kind of progress are you making [did you make] in reaching the goal (in learning what you set out to learn)?

See page 9A

2) Yes 7 Did you set a new goal (decide on something else you wanted to learn)?

a) No 3 [go to D.]
b) Yes 4 What is [was] it? See page 9A for goals achieved, new goals set

D. Have your reading skills been checked out since you started with the literacy [reading] program? [FOR LEARNERS NO LONGER BEING TUTORED: After you started receiving reading lessons, were your reading skills ever checked out by your tutor [teacher] or someone else in the literacy [reading] program?]

1. No 47 [Go to E.]
2. Yes 57

Within last 3 mos. - 16
Within last 6 mos. - 2
Within last 9 mos. - 2
Don't remember/NR - 37

a. When was the last time they were checked?

b. Who checked them? Tutor (47); program director/coordinator/ supervisor (4); college (1); other (5)

c. How were they checked? See page 9A

d. What were the results? See page 9A

E. Do you happen to know your present reading level?

1. No 82 [Go to F.]
2. Yes 22

a. What is it (grade level)? x = 4.7 (n= 22)

b. How do you know (who told you)? Tutor/teacher (16); program director/coordinator (2); just figured it out myself (1); kids (1); nobody (1); NR (1)